

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 88-511

H. R. 11579

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Index and summary of H. R. 11579..... | 1 |
| Digest of Public Law 88-511.....      | 2 |



## DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 88-511

### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT, 1965.

Includes appropriations for civil functions of the Department of the Army for rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes; Bureau of Reclamation and power-marketing agencies (Bonneville, Southeastern, and Southwestern Power Administrations) of the Department of the Interior; Atomic Energy Commission; Tennessee Valley Authority; and Delaware River Basin Commission.

Appropriates \$4 million to the President for the public works acceleration program.

Includes general provisions applicable to all departments and agencies during fiscal year 1965 as follows: Limits the amount which may be paid for a passenger vehicle to \$1,500, except for station wagons the maximum of which is \$1,950. Requires Federal employees to be U. S. citizens, with certain exceptions. Provides for quarters and cost-of-living allowances in accordance with the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act. Prohibits payments to persons for filling any position for which nominated if the Senate has rejected the nomination. Limits the price which may be paid for the U. S. Code to \$4 per volume, and for the Lifetime Federal Digest to \$4.25 per volume, and \$6.50 per volume on the Modern Federal Practice Digest. In the case of certain corporations, makes appropriations available for certain purposes, such as rent in the District of Columbia. Permits U. S. foreign credits (including foreign currencies) to be used by Federal agencies only when reimbursement is made to the Treasury Department from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned. Provides that during the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts. Prohibits the use of funds by any agency for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.









# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 12, 1964  
For actions of June 11, 1964  
88th-2nd; No. 117

### CONTENTS

|                           |                            |                         |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Adjournment.....17        | Expenditures.....2         | Meat.....24             |
| Aged.....10               | Farm program.....20        | Mushroom industry.....1 |
| Alaska.....8              | Foreign aid.....15         | Onions.....23           |
| Appropriations.....7,16   | Foreign trade.....14       | Pay.....5               |
| Area redevelopment.....13 | Forestry.....3             | Personnel.....2,5       |
| Arts.....11               | Housing.....6,16           | Poverty.....19          |
| CCC.....20                | Imports 16,21,24           | Public debt.....16      |
| Civil rights.....4        | Lands.....18               | Recreation.....18       |
| Community services.....10 | Legislative program.....16 | Roads.....3             |
| Cotton.....12,21          | Loans.....6,16             | Strawberries.....24     |
| Defense production.....16 | Marketing commission....20 | Textiles.....16,21      |
| Disaster relief.....8     | Marketing orders.....23    | Vehicles.....22         |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed pay bill. House committee reported measure for temporary extension of housing loan program for rural elderly. House subcommittee voted to report bill to aid Alaska reconstruction. House committee reported public works appropriation bill. Rep. Conte demanded names of mills receiving subsidies under cotton program. Rep. Talcott criticized area redevelopment program. Rep. Lipscomb criticized increased trade with Communist nations. Senate subcommittee approved road authorization bill.

### SENATE

1. MUSHROOM INDUSTRY. Received a Pa. Senate resolution urging action to protect the declining domestic mushroom industry. p. 12954
2. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures a report on Federal employment and pay for April 1964. pp. 12954-7
3. ROADS. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendment H. R. 10503, the road authorization bill, which includes authorizations for forest highways and forest development roads and trails for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; and S. 1593, to authorize funds for the planning of the Great River Road along the Mississippi Valley. p. D460
4. CIVIL RIGHTS. Continued debate on H. R. 7152, the civil rights bill. pp. 12960-64, 12968-71, 12973-97, 12999-13033.

HOUSE

5. PERSONNEL; PAY. By a vote of 243 to 157, passed with amendments H. R. 11049, the Federal pay increase bill (pp. 13035, 13036-74). See Digest 102 for a summary of items of interest to this Department.

Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Udall to provide for automatic adjustment of the salaries of Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and certain other top Government officials when other Federal salaries are adjusted in the future. pp. 13070-2

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Latta, to strike out the title providing for pay increases for the legislative branch. p. 13064

By Rep. Sikes, to provide that the salary increases, except for Members of Congress and certain other top officials, shall become effective Jan. 1, 1965, rather than the first pay period which begins on or after date of enactment of the bill. pp. 13072-3

By Rep. Findley, 60 to 162, to provide that the salary increases shall not become effective until Federal receipts exceed Federal expenditures. pp. 13073-4

6. HOUSING; LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 1041, to extend for 90 days, until Sept. 30, 1964, the Farmers Home Administration program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas (H. Rept. 1472). p. 13096

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 11579, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965 (H. Rept. 1479) (p. 13097). The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee granted a rule waiving points of order on title III of this bill (p. D462).

8. ALASKA; DISASTER RELIEF. The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 11438, to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act so as to provide assistance to Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent earthquake and subsequent seismic waves. p. D461

9. CIVIL DEFENSE. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee granted an open rule on H. R. 10314, to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act so as to extend for four years, until June 30, 1968, the program of financial assistance to States for civil defense activities. p. D462

10. AGED; COMMUNITY SERVICES. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10088, to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to States for community planning and services (H. Rept. 1477). p. 13097

11. INFORMATION; ARTS. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9586, to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts (H. Rept. 1476). p. 13097

12. COTTON. Rep. Conte stated that "20 cotton mills have received subsidies of \$20,068,060 under the so-called cotton stabilization program," that he was "overwhelmed by the fact that Secretary Freeman refused to announce the names of the firms receiving these handouts," and demanded that the Secretary disclose this information. pp. 13084-5



## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

---

JUNE 11, 1964.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 11579]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for certain Civil Functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Estimates considered by the Committee are those included in the budget document and in House Documents numbered 240 and 309. These estimates total \$4,372,449,000. The Committee recommends appropriations of \$4,325,969,200, a reduction of \$46,479,800 in the budget estimates and a decrease of \$79,534,500 below appropriations for fiscal year 1964. A comparative table showing appropriations for 1964, estimates and amounts recommended for 1965 appears at the end of this report. A brief summary of the bill by major activities is as follows:

| Activity                                               | Budget estimate,<br>1965 | Recommended by<br>the committee | Change from<br>budget estimate |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cemeterial expenses-----                               | \$13, 295, 000           | \$13, 295, 000                  | -----                          |
| Rivers and harbors and flood<br>control-----           | 1, 149, 364, 000         | 1, 178, 308, 200                | +\$28, 944, 200                |
| The Panama Canal-----                                  | 33, 909, 000             | 33, 909, 000                    | -----                          |
| Bureau of Reclamation-----                             | 317, 750, 000            | 318, 013, 000                   | +263, 000                      |
| Power agencies of the Depart-<br>ment of Interior----- | 64, 250, 000             | 61, 490, 000                    | -2, 760, 000                   |
| Atomic Energy Commission----                           | 2, 693, 000, 000         | 2, 624, 073, 000                | -68, 927, 000                  |
| Tennessee Valley Authority----                         | 50, 915, 000             | 47, 915, 000                    | -3, 000, 000                   |
| Delaware River Basin Com-<br>mission-----              | 131, 000                 | 131, 000                        | -----                          |
| Public Works acceleration-----                         | 5, 000, 000              | 4, 000, 000                     | -1, 000, 000                   |
| Indefinite appropriations-----                         | 44, 835, 000             | 44, 835, 000                    | -----                          |
| Total-----                                             | 4, 372, 449, 000         | 4, 325, 969, 200                | -46, 479, 800                  |

## NEW STARTS AND UNBUDGETED ITEMS

The budget estimates include 33 new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and 5 for the Bureau of Reclamation, a total of 38. The Committee is recommending funding of all of these and has added 16 for the Corps of Engineers, making a total of 54 new construction starts, excluding reimbursements and resumptions. In addition, the Committee recommends funds for 33 unbudgeted surveys and for the initiation of planning on 11 unbudgeted projects.

## TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

## CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$10, 800, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 13, 295, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 13, 295, 000   |
| Comparisons:             |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | +2, 495, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | -----          |

The funds provided under this heading are to cover the cost of interment in National cemeteries, grave markers, and the development and maintenance of cemetery properties. The increase above the 1964 appropriation is made necessary by additional workload and the development of contiguous grave site acreages at nine of the cemeteries to take care of an increasing number of interments.

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$19, 115, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 19, 795, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 20, 590, 000   |
| Comparisons:             |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | +1, 475, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | +795, 000      |

Funds provided under this heading are allocated to surveys and activities listed in the table which follows:

| Project                                                                             | Type of project               | General investigations |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Alabama:                                                                            |                               |                        |
| Warrior River and tributaries-----                                                  | Flood control--               | \$40, 000              |
| Alaska:                                                                             |                               |                        |
| Dry Straits-Wrangell Narrows-----                                                   | Navigation-----               | 72, 000                |
| Gastineau Channel-----                                                              | do-----                       | 25, 000                |
| Hydaburg Harbor-----                                                                | do-----                       | 21, 000                |
| Kachemak Bay-----                                                                   | Beach erosion--               | 32, 000                |
| Ketchikan Creek-----                                                                | Flood control--               | 25, 000                |
| King Cove Harbor-----                                                               | Navigation-----               | 21, 000                |
| Knik and Turnagain Arms-----                                                        | do-----                       | 27, 000                |
| Kodiak Harbor, small boat basin-----                                                | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 15, 000   |
| Sergius Narrows-----                                                                | do-----                       | 15, 000                |
| Arizona: Glendale-Maryvale-South Phoenix project Gila River.                        | Flood control--               | <sup>1</sup> 60, 000   |
| Arkansas: White River Basin, Ark. and Mo-----                                       | Comprehensive--               | 300, 000               |
| California:                                                                         |                               |                        |
| Atherton Creek-----                                                                 | Flood control--               | 25, 000                |
| Bear River-Garden Bar-----                                                          | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| Cache Creek-----                                                                    | do-----                       | 25, 000                |
| Creseent City, model study-----                                                     | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 50, 000   |
| Cueamonga Creek-----                                                                | Flood control--               | 50, 000                |
| Deer, Day, and Etiwanda-----                                                        | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 40, 000   |
| Eel River-----                                                                      | do-----                       | 100, 000               |
| El Grenada Beach-----                                                               | Beach erosion--               | 30, 000                |
| Fairfield and vicinity-----                                                         | Flood control--               | 25, 000                |
| Guadalupe River-----                                                                | do-----                       | 80, 000                |
| Isabella Reservoir, Kern River-----                                                 | do-----                       | 30, 000                |
| Jack and Simmerly Sloughs-----                                                      | do-----                       | 15, 000                |
| Jenner Harbor (Russian River)-----                                                  | Navigation-----               | 25, 000                |
| Mereed County streams-----                                                          | Flood control--               | 35, 000                |
| Morrison Creek group-----                                                           | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 50, 000   |
| Morro Bay Harbor-----                                                               | Navigation-----               | <sup>1</sup> 15, 000   |
| Northern California streams-----                                                    | Flood control--               | <sup>1</sup> 75, 000   |
| Pacifica-----                                                                       | Beach erosion--               | 30, 000                |
| Peseadero Creek-----                                                                | Flood control--               | <sup>1</sup> 30, 000   |
| Port Hueneme Harbor-----                                                            | Navigation-----               | 30, 000                |
| Poso-Deer-White Stream group-----                                                   | Flood control--               | 25, 000                |
| Richardson Bay streams-----                                                         | do-----                       | 15, 000                |
| Russian River, Redwood Valley Reservoir-----                                        | do-----                       | 35, 000                |
| Sacramento River at Chester-----                                                    | do-----                       | 20, 000                |
| Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta-----                                                   | do-----                       | 50, 000                |
| Sacramento-San Joaquin region-----                                                  | do-----                       | 20, 000                |
| Sacramento Valley navigation-----                                                   | Navigation-----               | 40, 000                |
| San Diego Harbor and Sweet Water River-----                                         | Navigation and flood control. | <sup>2</sup> 160, 000  |
| San Dieguito River-----                                                             | Flood control--               | <sup>1</sup> 40, 000   |
| San Luis Rey River-----                                                             | do-----                       | 50, 000                |
| San Mateo streams-----                                                              | do-----                       | 28, 000                |
| Santa Ana River basin-----                                                          | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 100, 000  |
| Santa Barbara streams-----                                                          | do-----                       | 50, 000                |
| Santa Clara River Basin-----                                                        | do-----                       | 35, 000                |
| University Wash and Spring Brook drainage.                                          | do-----                       | <sup>1</sup> 25, 000   |
| Upper Warm Creek-----                                                               | do-----                       | 50, 000                |
| Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks-----                                                   | do-----                       | 50, 000                |
| Colorado:                                                                           |                               |                        |
| Arkansas River above John Martin Dam-----                                           | do-----                       | 61, 000                |
| South Platte River-----                                                             | do-----                       | 33, 000                |
| Connecticut:                                                                        |                               |                        |
| Coastal rivers, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Maine. | do-----                       | 60, 000                |

| Project                                                                                     | Type of project   | General investigations |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Connecticut—Continued                                                                       |                   |                        |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire.                      | Comprehensive--   | \$275, 000             |
| Connecticut River, Hartford to Holyoke--                                                    | Navigation-----   | <sup>1</sup> 40, 000   |
| Park River, Hartford-----                                                                   | Flood control---- | 40, 000                |
| Delaware:                                                                                   |                   |                        |
| Delaware Bay-Chesapeake Bay Waterway, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.                     | -----do-----      | 28, 000                |
| Delaware coast-----                                                                         | Beach erosion---- | 30, 000                |
| Florida:                                                                                    |                   |                        |
| Brevard County streams-----                                                                 | Flood control---- | <sup>1</sup> 45, 000   |
| Choctowhatchee River, Fla. and Ala-----                                                     | Navigation-----   | 20, 000                |
| Crystal River-----                                                                          | -----do-----      | 30, 000                |
| Econlockhatchee River-----                                                                  | Flood control---- | 30, 000                |
| Escambia River, Fla. and Ala-----                                                           | Navigation-----   | 27, 000                |
| Everglades National Park-----                                                               | Flood control---- | 137, 000               |
| Intracoastal Waterway, St. Marks River-Tampa Bay.                                           | Navigation-----   | 80, 000                |
| Jupiter Island-----                                                                         | Beach erosion---- | 46, 000                |
| Martin County-----                                                                          | Flood control---- | 50, 000                |
| Miami Harbor-----                                                                           | Navigation-----   | 40, 000                |
| Miami River lock and dam-----                                                               | Flood control---- | <sup>1</sup> 44, 000   |
| Mullet Key-----                                                                             | Beach erosion---- | 24, 000                |
| Pinellas County-----                                                                        | -----do-----      | 21, 000                |
| St. Johns County-----                                                                       | -----do-----      | 15, 000                |
| Waccasassa River-----                                                                       | -----do-----      | 30, 000                |
| Yellow River-Crestview Reservoir-----                                                       | Flood control---- | <sup>1</sup> 30, 000   |
| Georgia:                                                                                    |                   |                        |
| Apalachicola River "308" report, Chattahoochee River, Columbus to Atlanta.                  | Navigation-----   | <sup>2</sup> 125, 000  |
| Peachtree and Nancy Creeks-----                                                             | Flood control---- | 30, 000                |
| Sea Island, St. Simons Island-----                                                          | Beach erosion---- | 40, 000                |
| Tybee Island-----                                                                           | -----do-----      | 16, 000                |
| Hawaii:                                                                                     |                   |                        |
| Explosives anchorage areas-----                                                             | Navigation-----   | 25, 000                |
| Iao Stream-----                                                                             | Flood control---- | 14, 000                |
| Lava barriers including Hilo Harbor-----                                                    | -----do-----      | 12, 000                |
| Waipio Stream-----                                                                          | -----do-----      | 35, 000                |
| Illinois:                                                                                   |                   |                        |
| Big Muddy River-----                                                                        | Comprehensive--   | 125, 000               |
| Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing Drainage District and Stringtown Drainage and Levee District. | Flood control---- | 30, 000                |
| Hammond-Whiting-East Chicago, Ill. and Ind.                                                 | Navigation-----   | 50, 000                |
| Saline River-----                                                                           | Flood control---- | 65, 000                |
| Wabash River, Ill. and Ind-----                                                             | Comprehensive--   | <sup>2</sup> 778, 000  |
| Indiana:                                                                                    |                   |                        |
| Crooked Creek, Madison-----                                                                 | Flood control---- | 41, 000                |
| Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio-----                                                            | -----do-----      | 15, 000                |
| Michigan City Harbor-----                                                                   | Navigation-----   | 12, 000                |
| Whitewater River and tributaries, Indiana and Ohio.                                         | Flood control---- | 35, 000                |
| Iowa:                                                                                       |                   |                        |
| Big Sioux River at Sioux City-----                                                          | -----do-----      | 16, 000                |
| Des Moines River-----                                                                       | -----do-----      | 33, 000                |
| Duck Creek-----                                                                             | -----do-----      | 16, 000                |
| Jefferson Dam-----                                                                          | -----do-----      | <sup>2</sup> 68, 000   |
| Little Sioux River-----                                                                     | -----do-----      | 35, 000                |
| Nishnabotna River Valley-----                                                               | -----do-----      | <sup>1</sup> 50, 000   |
| Skunk River and Squaw Creek-----                                                            | -----do-----      | 50, 000                |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 9.



| Project                                                                                    | Type of project  | General investigations |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Kansas:</b>                                                                             |                  |                        |
| Arkansas River and tributaries from Great Bend, Kans., to John Martin Dam, Kans. and Colo. | Flood Control... | \$75, 000              |
| Arkansas River, Hutchinson-Cimarron River, Kans. and Okla.                                 | -----do-----     | 50, 000                |
| Cimarron River, Kans., N. Mex., Okla., and Colo.                                           | -----do-----     | 60, 000                |
| Kansas River-----                                                                          | Navigation-----  | <sup>1</sup> 26, 000   |
| Mud Creek (tributary of Cottonwood River).                                                 | Flood control--- | 15, 000                |
| Shunganunga Creek watershed-----                                                           | -----do-----     | 10, 000                |
| <b>Kentucky:</b>                                                                           |                  |                        |
| Big Sandy River, Ky., W. Va., and Va-----                                                  | -----do-----     | 41, 000                |
| Green and Barren Rivers-----                                                               | Navigation-----  | 43, 000                |
| Humphreys Creek to Columbus-----                                                           | Flood control--- | 22, 000                |
| Kentucky River and tributaries-----                                                        | -----do-----     | 75, 000                |
| Salt River-----                                                                            | -----do-----     | 65, 000                |
| Upper Cumberland River-----                                                                | -----do-----     | 70, 000                |
| <b>Louisiana:</b>                                                                          |                  |                        |
| Chefuncte River-----                                                                       | -----do-----     | 20, 000                |
| Grand Isle-----                                                                            | Beach erosion--- | 25, 000                |
| Plaquemine lock freshwater-----                                                            | Navigation-----  | 6, 000                 |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.                                    | Comprehensive--  | 300, 000               |
| Tangipahoa River-----                                                                      | Flood control--- | 37, 000                |
| <b>Maine:</b>                                                                              |                  |                        |
| Kennebec River-----                                                                        | -----do-----     | 30, 000                |
| Saco River-----                                                                            | Navigation-----  | 13, 000                |
| Saco River, Maine and N.H.-----                                                            | Flood control--- | 65, 000                |
| St. John River Basin-----                                                                  | Comprehensive--  | 75, 000                |
| <b>Maryland:</b>                                                                           |                  |                        |
| Anacostia River and tributaries, Maryland and District of Columbia.                        | Flood control--- | 21, 000                |
| Cuckold Creek-Wicomico River-----                                                          | Navigation-----  | 12, 000                |
| Miscellaneous streams, Maryland and Pennsylvania.                                          | Flood control--- | 50, 000                |
| Tilghman Island Harbor-----                                                                | Navigation-----  | 10, 000                |
| Worcester County (Maryland coast)-----                                                     | Beach erosion--- | 20, 000                |
| <b>Massachusetts:</b>                                                                      |                  |                        |
| New Bedford Harbor-----                                                                    | Navigation-----  | 20, 000                |
| Pleasant Bay-----                                                                          | -----do-----     | 21, 000                |
| Shirley Gut-Winthrop-----                                                                  | -----do-----     | 10, 000                |
| <b>Michigan:</b>                                                                           |                  |                        |
| Charlevoix Harbor-----                                                                     | -----do-----     | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| Clinton River-----                                                                         | Flood control--- | 23, 000                |
| Grand River Basin-----                                                                     | Comprehensive--  | 175, 000               |
| Harrisville Harbor-----                                                                    | Navigation-----  | 10, 000                |
| Huron River-----                                                                           | Flood control--- | 40, 000                |
| Lake Erie coast, Michigan and Ohio-----                                                    | Navigation-----  | 25, 000                |
| Manistique and Indian Rivers-----                                                          | Flood control--- | 25, 000                |
| St. Joseph River-----                                                                      | -----do-----     | 100, 000               |
| Shore of Lake Huron-----                                                                   | Navigation-----  | 25, 000                |
| <b>Minnesota:</b>                                                                          |                  |                        |
| Bassett Creek-----                                                                         | Flood control--- | 17, 000                |
| Minnesota River Valley-----                                                                | -----do-----     | <sup>1</sup> 50, 000   |
| Mississippi River headwater reservoir-----                                                 | Navigation-----  | 19, 000                |
| Root River-----                                                                            | Flood control--- | 20, 000                |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin, Minn., Ill., Mo., Iowa, Ind., S. Dak., and Wis.             | Comprehensive--  | 350, 000               |
| Yellow Medicine-Lac Qui Parle Rivers-----                                                  | Flood control--- | 20, 000                |
| Zumbro River-----                                                                          | -----do-----     | 33, 000                |

See footnote at end of table, p. 9.

| Project                                                                                            | Type of project    | General investigations |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Mississippi:                                                                                       |                    |                        |
| Big Black River-----                                                                               | Comprehensive--    | \$65, 000              |
| Pascagoula River Basin-----                                                                        | do-----            | <sup>2</sup> 200, 000  |
| Pearl River Basin, Miss. and La-----                                                               | do-----            | 125, 000               |
| Missouri:                                                                                          |                    |                        |
| Big Blue River, Kansas City-----                                                                   | Flood control---   | 30, 000                |
| Gasconade River and tributary-----                                                                 | do-----            | 50, 000                |
| Little Blue River-----                                                                             | do-----            | 20, 000                |
| Missouri River Basin, Mo., Mont., N.Dak.,<br>S.Dak., Colo., Nebr., Iowa, Miss., Kans.,<br>and Wyo. | Comprehensive--    | 250, 000               |
| Osage River, additional tributary reservoir-----                                                   | Flood control---   | 25, 000                |
| Spring River, Mo., Ark., Kans., and Okla-----                                                      | do-----            | 50, 000                |
| Wears Creek-----                                                                                   | do-----            | 13, 000                |
| Montana:                                                                                           |                    |                        |
| Beaver Creek (Milk River)-----                                                                     | do-----            | 20, 000                |
| Nebraska:                                                                                          |                    |                        |
| Big Blue River Basin, Nebr. and Kans-----                                                          | do-----            | 40, 000                |
| Elkhorn River-----                                                                                 | do-----            | 50, 000                |
| Niobrara River (Gavins Point Reservoir),<br>Nebr. and S. Dak.                                      | do-----            | 83, 000                |
| Platte River-----                                                                                  | do-----            | 30, 000                |
| New Jersey:                                                                                        |                    |                        |
| Camden County streams-----                                                                         | do-----            | 100, 000               |
| Jersey meadows, New Jersey and New York-----                                                       | Special-----       | 150, 000               |
| New Jersey coastal inlets and beaches-----                                                         | Navigation-----    | 30, 000                |
| Do-----                                                                                            | Beach erosion----- | 49, 000                |
| New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway-----                                                              | Navigation-----    | 25, 000                |
| Passaic River-----                                                                                 | Flood control---   | 197, 000               |
| Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays-----                                                                   | do-----            | 20, 000                |
| Raritan River-----                                                                                 | do-----            | 50, 000                |
| New Mexico:                                                                                        |                    |                        |
| Pecos River and tributary above Santa<br>Rosa.                                                     | do-----            | 40, 000                |
| Rio Hondo and Rio Felix-----                                                                       | do-----            | 60, 000                |
| Santa Fe River-----                                                                                | do-----            | 65, 000                |
| New York:                                                                                          |                    |                        |
| Braddock Bay State Park and Cranberry<br>and Long Pond.                                            | Navigation-----    | 20, 000                |
| Cattaraugus Creek-----                                                                             | Flood control---   | 15, 000                |
| Champlain Waterway, N. Y. and Vt-----                                                              | Navigation-----    | 28, 000                |
| Chittenango Creek and tributary-----                                                               | Flood control---   | 25, 000                |
| Genesee River Basin, N. Y. and Pa-----                                                             | Comprehensive--    | 130, 000               |
| Great Lakes, Hudson River Waterway-----                                                            | Special-----       | 200, 000               |
| Great South Bay and Patchogue River,<br>Suffolk County.                                            | Navigation-----    | <sup>1</sup> 31, 000   |
| Hamlin Beach State Park-----                                                                       | do-----            | 15, 000                |
| Hempstead Harbor-----                                                                              | do-----            | 25, 000                |
| Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Waterway (All-<br>American Canal).                                          | Special-----       | <sup>1</sup> 200, 000  |
| Lemon Creek-----                                                                                   | Flood control---   | <sup>1</sup> 24, 000   |
| Locust Point Harbor-----                                                                           | Navigation-----    | 12, 000                |
| New York and New Jersey Channels,<br>N. Y. and N. J.                                               | do-----            | 22, 000                |
| Scajaquada Creek-----                                                                              | Flood control---   | 20, 000                |
| South shore of Lake Ontario (Fort Niag-<br>ara, Four Mile Creek, Golden Hill State<br>Park).       | Beach erosion---   | <sup>1</sup> 5, 000    |
| Suffolk County north shore, Long Island-----                                                       | do-----            | 60, 000                |
| Tonawanda Creek and tributaries-----                                                               | Flood control---   | 48, 000                |
| Wilson Harbor-----                                                                                 | Navigation-----    | 14, 000                |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 9.



| Project                                                                                                                                   | Type of project    | General investigations |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| <b>North Carolina:</b>                                                                                                                    |                    |                        |
| Cape Fear River.....                                                                                                                      | Flood control..... | \$78, 000              |
| Manteo-Shallowbag Bay (Oregon Inlet and Wanchese).....                                                                                    | Navigation.....    | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| Tar River, N.C. and S.C.....                                                                                                              | Flood control..... | 60, 000                |
| Yadkin-Pee Dee River, N.C. and S.C.....                                                                                                   | do.....            | 45, 000                |
| <b>North Dakota:</b>                                                                                                                      |                    |                        |
| James River, N. Dak. and S. Dak.....                                                                                                      | do.....            | 35, 000                |
| Missouri River between Garrison and Fort Peck.....                                                                                        | do.....            | 60, 000                |
| Red River of the North, N. Dak. and Minn.....                                                                                             | do.....            | 70, 000                |
| <b>Ohio:</b>                                                                                                                              |                    |                        |
| Ashtabula, Lake County line to Ashtabula.....                                                                                             | Beach erosion..... | 7, 000                 |
| Cuyahoga River.....                                                                                                                       | Flood control..... | 51, 000                |
| Hocking River.....                                                                                                                        | do.....            | 24, 000                |
| Ironton.....                                                                                                                              | do.....            | <sup>1</sup> 25, 000   |
| Lake Erie coast, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York.....                                                                                    | Navigation.....    | 35, 000                |
| Ohio River Basin review, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, Tennessee, New York, Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland..... | Comprehensive..... | 375, 000               |
| Sandusky River.....                                                                                                                       | Flood control..... | 60, 000                |
| <b>Oklahoma:</b>                                                                                                                          |                    |                        |
| Poteau River, Okla. and Ark.....                                                                                                          | do.....            | 79, 000                |
| Red River, Sherwood Reservoir.....                                                                                                        | do.....            | 25, 000                |
| <b>Oregon:</b>                                                                                                                            |                    |                        |
| Coos Bay (Charleston Harbor).....                                                                                                         | Navigation.....    | 12, 000                |
| Coos Bay deep draft harbor.....                                                                                                           | do.....            | 20, 000                |
| Coquille River.....                                                                                                                       | do.....            | 9, 000                 |
| Coquille River and tributaries.....                                                                                                       | Flood control..... | 10, 000                |
| Herman Creek.....                                                                                                                         | Navigation.....    | 10, 000                |
| Malheur River and tributaries.....                                                                                                        | Flood control..... | <sup>1</sup> 25, 000   |
| McKay Creek.....                                                                                                                          | do.....            | 23, 000                |
| Nestucco River.....                                                                                                                       | do.....            | 10, 000                |
| Tillamook Bay streams.....                                                                                                                | do.....            | 20, 000                |
| Umpqua River and tributaries.....                                                                                                         | do.....            | 57, 000                |
| Willamette River Basin.....                                                                                                               | Comprehensive..... | 350, 000               |
| <b>Pennsylvania:</b>                                                                                                                      |                    |                        |
| Darby and Cobb Creeks.....                                                                                                                | Flood control..... | 30, 000                |
| Delaware River channel dimensions, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.....                                                            | Navigation.....    | 35, 000                |
| Johnstown Channel extension.....                                                                                                          | Flood control..... | 15, 000                |
| Susquehanna River Basin, Pa., Md., and N.Y.....                                                                                           | Comprehensive..... | 400, 000               |
| Walnut Bottom Run, Beaver Falls.....                                                                                                      | Flood control..... | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| <b>Puerto Rico:</b>                                                                                                                       |                    |                        |
| Portugues and Bucana Rivers.....                                                                                                          | do.....            | 20, 000                |
| <b>South Carolina:</b>                                                                                                                    |                    |                        |
| Cooper River.....                                                                                                                         | Navigation.....    | <sup>2</sup> 390, 000  |
| Santee River system, South Carolina and North Carolina.....                                                                               | do.....            | 37, 000                |
| <b>South Dakota:</b>                                                                                                                      |                    |                        |
| Upper Big Sioux River and tributaries, South Dakota, and Iowa.....                                                                        | Flood control..... | 40, 000                |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 9.

| Project                                                                               | Type of project  | General investigations |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Texas:                                                                                |                  |                        |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. | Special-----     | \$125, 000             |
| Blanco and San Marcos Rivers and tributaries.                                         | Flood control--- | 25, 000                |
| Brazos River and tributaries-----                                                     | do-----          | 350, 000               |
| Clear Creek-----                                                                      | do-----          | 42, 000                |
| Colorado River and tributaries-----                                                   | do-----          | 160, 000               |
| Corpus Christi Bay beach erosion and hurricane control study.                         | Beach erosion--- | <sup>1</sup> 15, 000   |
| Dickinson Bayou-Moses Lake-----                                                       | Navigation-----  | 11, 000                |
| Goose Creek-----                                                                      | do-----          | 26, 000                |
| Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers-----                                                 | do-----          | 50, 000                |
| Lavaca-Navidad Rivers-----                                                            | Flood control--- | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| Neches River and tributaries-----                                                     | do-----          | 175, 000               |
| Peyton's Creek-----                                                                   | do-----          | 20, 000                |
| Sabine River Basin-----                                                               | Comprehensive--- | 130, 000               |
| San Bernard River-----                                                                | Flood control--- | 25, 000                |
| San Felipe Creek-----                                                                 | do-----          | 28, 000                |
| San Jacinto River and tributaries (Cypress Creek).                                    | do-----          | 50, 000                |
| Texas coast-----                                                                      | Special-----     | 250, 000               |
| Utah:                                                                                 |                  |                        |
| Jordan River Basin-----                                                               | Flood control--- | 20, 000                |
| Mill and Pack Creeks-----                                                             | do-----          | 50, 000                |
| Salt Lake City streams-----                                                           | do-----          | 25, 000                |
| Virginia: James River, Lynchburg-----                                                 | do-----          | 50, 000                |
| Washington:                                                                           |                  |                        |
| Ben Franklin Dam site-----                                                            | Navigation-----  | 200, 000               |
| Columbia River, navigation to Rock Island-----                                        | do-----          | 100, 000               |
| Columbia River, Pudget Sound Intra-coastal Waterway.                                  | do-----          | 100, 000               |
| Pudget Sound area-----                                                                | Comprehensive--- | 275, 000               |
| Quilcene Bay Harbor-----                                                              | Navigation-----  | 16, 000                |
| Seattle Harbor (Duwanish Waterway)-----                                               | do-----          | 10, 000                |
| Stillaguamish River-----                                                              | do-----          | 20, 000                |
| Titlow Beach-----                                                                     | Beach erosion--- | 13, 000                |
| West Virginia:                                                                        |                  |                        |
| Kanawha River Basin, W. Va., Va., and N.C.                                            | Comprehensive--- | 250, 000               |
| Middle Island Creek Basin-----                                                        | Flood control--- | <sup>1</sup> 20, 000   |
| Wheeling Creek, W. Va. and Pa-----                                                    | do-----          | 20, 000                |
| Wisconsin:                                                                            |                  |                        |
| Baraboo River-----                                                                    | do-----          | 17, 000                |
| Deer County-----                                                                      | Navigation-----  | 25, 000                |
| Fox River and tributaries-----                                                        | Flood control--- | 85, 000                |
| Oconto River-----                                                                     | Navigation-----  | 17, 000                |
| State Road and Ebner Coulees, La Crosse-----                                          | Flood control--- | 25, 000                |
| Subtotal, all States-----                                                             |                  | 15, 570, 000           |

See footnote at end of table, p. 9.

| Project                                                                          | Type of project | General investigations |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Budget items not listed under States:                                            |                 |                        |
| General investigations:                                                          |                 |                        |
| Special studies:                                                                 |                 |                        |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.). | -----           | \$260, 000             |
| Collection and study of basic data:                                              |                 |                        |
| Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).                                          | -----           | 280, 000               |
| Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).                                     | -----           | 480, 000               |
| Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).                      | -----           | 210, 000               |
| International water studies.                                                     | -----           | 85, 000                |
| Flood plain studies.                                                             | -----           | 725, 000               |
| Research and development:                                                        |                 |                        |
| Beach erosion development studies.                                               | -----           | 850, 000               |
| Hydrologic studies.                                                              | -----           | 190, 000               |
| Civil works investigations.                                                      | -----           | 1, 500, 000            |
| Mississippi Basin model:                                                         |                 |                        |
| (1) Maintenance.                                                                 | -----           | 150, 000               |
| (2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.                                       | -----           | 210, 000               |
| Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.                               | -----           | 1, 080, 000            |
| Subtotal, other items-----                                                       | -----           | 6, 020, 000            |
| General reduction due to slippage-----                                           | -----           | —1, 000, 000           |
| Total, general investigations-----                                               | -----           | 20, 590, 000           |

<sup>1</sup> Unbudgeted.<sup>2</sup> Includes increase above budget.

*Nenana River, Alaska.*—Funds budgeted for this project in the amount of \$75,000 have been deleted. The proposed study involves flood control and hydro-power development. Under the recent agreement between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation on areas of responsibility in Alaska, the Bureau is the basic investigating agency while the Corps is primarily the constructing agency. It is the Committee's opinion that if the study is to be undertaken it should be done by the Bureau of Reclamation rather than the Corps.

*Coast of Hawaiian Islands.*—An additional \$56,000 budgeted for this study has been deleted. This study includes a number of small boat harbors on the coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, some of which were to be accomplished by the Corps and some by the State. The Corps report is scheduled for completion in the current fiscal year, at a total cost of \$383,000. The additional funds requested would add three more harbor sites which the State was to accomplish under the original plan. The Committee sees no reason why the Federal Government should relieve the State of part of its responsibility in this undertaking.

*Saginaw River, Mich.*—The Committee directs that \$10,000 of available funds be used for this study.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

|                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$827, 146, 500 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 879, 308, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 905, 767, 200   |
| Comparisons:             |                 |
| Appropriation 1964.....  | +78, 620, 700   |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | +26, 459, 200   |

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended for advance engineering and design (planning) and for actual construction:

| Construction, general, State and project          | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | House allowance |           |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                                   | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  |
| Alabama:                                          |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)           |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| Claiborne lock and dam                            | \$1,000,000                                          |           | \$1,000,000     |           |
| Holt lock and dam                                 | 8,000,000                                            |           | 8,000,000       |           |
| Jones Bluff lock and dam                          |                                                      | \$134,000 |                 | \$134,000 |
| Millers Ferry lock and dam                        | 6,000,000                                            |           | 6,000,000       |           |
| Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel                     | 1,500,000                                            |           | 1,500,000       |           |
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.      |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)       |                                                      | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |
| Alaska:                                           |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| Snettisham power project                          |                                                      | 750,000   |                 | 750,000   |
| Arizona:                                          |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| Alamo Reservoir                                   | 2,500,000                                            |           | 2,500,000       |           |
| Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| Pinal Creek                                       |                                                      | 251,000   |                 | 251,000   |
| Tucson diversion channel                          | 2,400,000                                            | 55,000    | 2,400,000       | 55,000    |



| Construction, general, State and project                                              | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | House allowance |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                                                                       | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  |
| Arkansas:                                                                             |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| (N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas<br>and Oklahoma:                         |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| (a) Bank stabilization and channel<br>rectification-----                              | \$15,000,000                                         |           | \$15,000,000    |           |
| (b) Navigation locks and dams-----                                                    | 42,000,000                                           |           | 47,000,000      |           |
| Beaver reservoir-----                                                                 | 4,500,000                                            |           | 4,500,000       |           |
| Dardanelle lock and dam-----                                                          | 10,000,000                                           |           | 10,000,000      |           |
| De Queen Reservoir-----                                                               |                                                      | \$245,000 |                 | \$245,000 |
| Degray Reservoir-----                                                                 | 7,100,000                                            |           | 7,100,000       |           |
| Dierks Reservoir-----                                                                 |                                                      | 150,000   |                 | 150,000   |
| Garland City-----                                                                     | 250,000                                              |           | 250,000         |           |
| Gillham Reservoir-----                                                                | 2,500,000                                            |           | 2,500,000       |           |
| Maniece Bayou, upstream extension-----                                                | 100,000                                              |           | 100,000         |           |
| Millwood Reservoir-----                                                               | 17,697,000                                           |           | 17,697,000      |           |
| Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit-----                                           | 350,000                                              |           | 350,000         |           |
| Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La-----                                           | 3,000,000                                            |           | 3,000,000       |           |
| Ozark lock and dam-----                                                               | 1,000,000                                            |           | 1,000,000       |           |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization<br>below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex----- | 300,000                                              |           | 300,000         |           |
| Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry<br>Levee Districts-----                      |                                                      | 87,000    |                 | 87,000    |
| California:                                                                           |                                                      |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam-----                                                | 750,000                                              |           | 750,000         |           |
| (FC) Bear Creek-----                                                                  | 900,000                                              |           | 900,000         |           |

|      |                                                            |         |            |         |         |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|
| (FC) | Buchanan Reservoir                                         | 200,000 | 3,350,000  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Camanche Reservoir                                         | 100,000 |            | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Corte Madera Creek                                         | 100,000 |            | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| (N)  | Dana Point Harbor                                          |         |            |         |         |
| (FC) | Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement | 450,000 |            | 450,000 | 450,000 |
| (FC) | Hidden Reservoir                                           | 250,000 |            | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| (BE) | Imperial Beach (reimbursement)                             |         | 26,000     |         |         |
| (FC) | Los Angeles County drainage area                           |         | 15,000,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries                    |         | 1,000,000  |         |         |
| (N)  | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor                              |         | 600,000    |         |         |
| (N)  | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)      |         |            |         |         |
| (FC) | Merced River Reservoirs                                    | 50,000  |            | 50,000  |         |
| (N)  | Monterey Harbor                                            | 90,000  |            | 90,000  | 90,000  |
| (FC) | Mormon Slough                                              | 75,000  |            | 75,000  | 75,000  |
| (MP) | New Melones Reservoir                                      | 450,000 |            | 450,000 | 700,000 |
| (N)  | Oakland Inner Harbor                                       |         |            |         | 110,000 |
| (FC) | Oroville Reservoir                                         |         | 9,000,000  |         |         |
| (BE) | Point Mugu to San Pedro (reimbursement)                    |         | 196,000    |         |         |
| (FC) | Redwood Creek                                              | 125,000 |            | 125,000 | 125,000 |
| (FC) | Sacramento River bank protection                           |         | 1,150,000  |         |         |
| (FC) | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries           |         | 1,530,000  |         |         |
| (N)  | Sacramento River deep water ship channel                   |         | 350,000    |         |         |
| (N)  | Santa Barbara Harbor                                       |         |            |         |         |
| (N)  | Santa Cruz Harbor                                          |         | 105,000    |         |         |
| (FC) | Tahchevah Creek                                            |         | 830,000    |         |         |
| (BE) | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)                      |         | 224,000    |         |         |
| (FC) | Walnut Creek                                               |         | 1,810,000  |         |         |
| (FC) | West Fork Reservoir                                        | 207,000 |            | 207,000 | 207,000 |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                            | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                                                     | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| Colorado:                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Trinidad Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                   |            | \$750, 000      |            |
| Connecticut:                                                                                                        |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Ansonia-Derby                                                                                                  |                                                   | \$175, 000 |                 | \$175, 000 |
| (FC) Black Rock Reservoir                                                                                           |                                                   | 50, 000    |                 | 50, 000    |
| (FC) Colebrook River Reservoir                                                                                      | \$500, 000                                        |            | 500, 000        |            |
| (N) Connecticut River below Hartford—North Cove                                                                     |                                                   |            | 578, 000        |            |
| (FC) Hancock Brook Reservoir                                                                                        | 1, 279, 000                                       |            | 1, 279, 000     |            |
| (FC) Hop Brook Reservoir                                                                                            | 400, 000                                          |            | 400, 000        |            |
| (FC) New London Barrier                                                                                             |                                                   | 100, 000   |                 | 100, 000   |
| (FC) Northfield Brook Reservoir                                                                                     | 1, 346, 000                                       |            | 1, 346, 000     |            |
| (FC) Stamford                                                                                                       | 1, 700, 000                                       |            | 1, 700, 000     |            |
| (FC) West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                        | 2, 300, 000                                       |            | 2, 300, 000     |            |
| Delaware:                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)          |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (N) Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | 11, 500, 000                                      |            | 11, 500, 000    |            |
| (BE) Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)                                                           | 110, 000                                          |            | 110, 000        |            |

|          |                                                                               |              |          |              |          |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| Florida: |                                                                               |              |          |              |          |
| (N)      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                       |              |          |              |          |
| (N)      | Apalachicola River channel improvement                                        | 100, 000     |          | 100, 000     |          |
| (FC)     | Canaveral Harbor                                                              | 3, 900, 000  |          | 3, 900, 000  |          |
| (N)      | Central and southern Florida                                                  | 13, 500, 000 |          | 13, 500, 000 |          |
| (FC)     | Cross Florida barge canal                                                     | 4, 000, 000  |          | 4, 000, 000  |          |
| (N)      | Four River Basins                                                             |              | 200, 000 |              | 200, 000 |
| (N)      | Intraeastal Waterway:                                                         |              |          |              |          |
|          | (a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River                                     |              |          |              |          |
| (N)      | Miami Harbor                                                                  | 700, 000     |          | 700, 000     |          |
| (BE)     | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement) | 1, 076, 000  |          | 1, 076, 000  |          |
| (N)      | Palm Beach Harbor                                                             | 10, 000      |          | 10, 000      |          |
| (N)      | Pensacola Harbor                                                              | 1, 300, 000  |          | 1, 300, 000  |          |
| (N)      | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)                                             | 300, 000     |          | 300, 000     |          |
| (N)      | Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channel                                    | 1, 254, 000  |          | 1, 254, 000  |          |
|          |                                                                               | 150, 000     |          | 150, 000     |          |
| Georgia: |                                                                               |              |          |              |          |
|          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                       |              |          |              |          |
| (MP)     | Carters Dam                                                                   | 6, 000, 000  |          | 6, 000, 000  |          |
| (N)      | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin                                   | 340, 000     |          | 340, 000     |          |
| (MP)     | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.                                            |              | 500, 000 |              | 500, 000 |
| Hawaii:  |                                                                               |              |          |              |          |
| (N)      | Hilo Harbor                                                                   |              | 550, 000 |              | 550, 000 |
| (R)      | Kahului Harbor (breakwater)                                                   | 1, 000, 000  |          | 1, 000, 000  |          |
| (FC)     | Kawainui Swamp                                                                | 700, 000     |          | 700, 000     |          |

| Construction, general, State and project                                     | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | House allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                                                              | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  |
| Idaho:                                                                       |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Blackfoot Reservoir                                                     |                                                   | \$46, 000 |                 | \$46, 000 |
| (MP) Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir                                        | \$8, 500, 000                                     |           | \$8, 500, 000   |           |
| (FC) Heise-Roberts Extension                                                 |                                                   | 70, 000   |                 | 70, 000   |
| (FC) Ririe Reservoir                                                         |                                                   |           |                 | 400, 000  |
| Illinois:                                                                    |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (BA) Calumet River, bridges                                                  | 1, 300, 000                                       |           | 1, 300, 000     |           |
| (N) Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:                                 |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)               | 1, 500, 000                                       |           | 2, 500, 000     |           |
| (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor                           |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Carlyle Reservoir                                                       | 2, 500, 000                                       |           | 2, 500, 000     |           |
| (R) Chicago Harbor (breakwater)                                              | 7, 200, 000                                       |           | 7, 200, 000     |           |
| (FC) East St. Louis and vicinity                                             | 700, 000                                          |           | 700, 000        |           |
| (FC) England Pond levee                                                      | 400, 000                                          |           | 400, 000        |           |
| (FC) Freeport                                                                |                                                   | 125, 000  |                 | 30, 000   |
| (N) Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana |                                                   |           |                 | 125, 000  |
| (FC) Indian Grave Drainage District                                          | 5, 000, 000                                       |           | 5, 000, 000     |           |
| (FC) Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)                      |                                                   | 96, 000   |                 | 96, 000   |
| (N) Kaskaskia River                                                          |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District                                 |                                                   | 400, 000  |                 | 400, 000  |
|                                                                              |                                                   | 140, 000  |                 | 140, 000  |



|      |                                                                                           |            |         |  |         |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|--|---------|
| (N)  | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:                         |            |         |  |         |
|      | (a) Regulating works-----                                                                 | 2,000,000  |         |  |         |
|      | (b) Chain of Rocks-----                                                                   | 1,300,000  |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Mount Carmel-----                                                                         | 700,000    |         |  |         |
| (FC) | New Athens-----                                                                           | 120,000    |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Oakley Reservoir-----                                                                     |            | 275,000 |  | 275,000 |
| (FC) | Prairie Du-Pont Levee and Sanitary District                                               |            |         |  | 47,000  |
| (FC) | Rend Lake Reservoir-----                                                                  | 1,000,000  |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Richland Creek-----                                                                       |            | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee-----                                                  | 750,000    |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Saline River and tributaries-----                                                         |            | 75,000  |  | 75,000  |
| (FC) | Shelbyville Reservoir-----                                                                | 2,800,000  |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Sny Island Levee Drainage District-----                                                   |            |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1                                                 |            |         |  |         |
| (FC) | and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District-----                                           |            |         |  |         |
|      | The Sny Basin-----                                                                        | 1,000,000  |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Tri-pond levee-----                                                                       | 1,700,000  |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Indiana:                                                                                  | 470,000    |         |  |         |
|      | Brookville Reservoir-----                                                                 |            | 165,000 |  | 165,000 |
| (FC) | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)                                   |            |         |  |         |
| (N)  | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----                                        |            |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Evansville-----                                                                           | 11,600,000 |         |  |         |
| (FC) | Huntington Reservoir-----                                                                 | 900,000    |         |  |         |
|      | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.) | 2,800,000  |         |  |         |

| Construction, general, State and project                     | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | House allowance |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                                              | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  |
| Indiana—Continued                                            |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Island levee, Indiana and Illinois-----                 |                                                   | \$38, 000 |                 | \$38, 000 |
| (FC) Levee unit 5, Wabash River-----                         | \$1, 500, 000                                     |           | \$1, 500, 000   |           |
| (FC) Mason J. Niblack levee-----                             | 170, 000                                          |           | 170, 000        |           |
| McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.) |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Mississinewa Reservoir-----                             | 6, 000, 000                                       |           | 6, 000, 000     |           |
| (FC) Monroe Reservoir-----                                   | 1, 649, 000                                       |           | 1, 649, 000     |           |
| (N) Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----        |                                                   | 110, 000  |                 |           |
| (FC) Salamonie Reservoir-----                                | 5, 500, 000                                       |           | 2, 100, 000     |           |
| (N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----       | 1, 000, 000                                       |           | 5, 500, 000     |           |
| Iowa:                                                        |                                                   |           | 1, 000, 000     |           |
| (FC) Central City Reservoir (restudy)-----                   |                                                   |           |                 | 60, 000   |
| (FC) Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge-----              | 500, 000                                          |           | 500, 000        |           |
| (FC) Des Moines-----                                         | 200, 000                                          |           | 200, 000        |           |
| (FC) Dubuque-----                                            |                                                   | 100, 000  |                 | 100, 000  |
| (FC) Floyd River and tributaries-----                        | 3, 221, 000                                       |           | 3, 221, 000     |           |
| (FC) Green Bay Levee Drainage District No. 2-----            | 500, 000                                          |           | 500, 000        |           |
| (FC) Indian Creek Dam-----                                   | 300, 000                                          |           | 300, 000        |           |
| (FC) Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16-----       | 1, 500, 000                                       |           | 1, 500, 000     |           |

|      |                                                                                       |            |         |            |         |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska              | 4,000,000  | -----   | 4,000,000  | -----   |
| (N)  | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:           |            |         |            |         |
|      | (a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.                                                 | 3,500,000  | -----   | 3,500,000  | -----   |
|      | (b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City                                                      | 2,700,000  | -----   | 4,000,000  | -----   |
|      | (c) Kansas City to the mouth                                                          | 3,500,000  | -----   | 3,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13  |            |         | 100,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Rathbun Reservoir                                                                     | 1,750,000  | -----   | 1,750,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Red Rock Reservoir                                                                    | 16,500,000 | -----   | 16,500,000 | -----   |
| (FC) | Saylorville Reservoir                                                                 | 1,200,000  | -----   | 1,200,000  | -----   |
|      | Kansas:                                                                               |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Atchison                                                                              |            | 160,000 | -----      | 160,000 |
| (FC) | Big Hill Reservoir                                                                    |            | 100,000 | -----      | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Clinton Reservoir                                                                     |            | 240,000 | -----      | 240,000 |
| (FC) | Council Grove Reservoir                                                               | 688,000    | -----   | 688,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Elk City Reservoir                                                                    | 7,500,000  | -----   | 7,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Fort Scott Reservoir                                                                  |            |         | 100,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir                                                       | 1,288,000  | -----   | 1,288,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)                                                |            | 100,000 | -----      | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Lawrence                                                                              |            |         | 300,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Marion Reservoir                                                                      | 2,700,000  | -----   | 2,700,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Marysville                                                                            |            |         | 200,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Melvorn Reservoir                                                                     |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Merriam                                                                               |            | 230,000 | -----      | 230,000 |
| (FC) | Milford Reservoir                                                                     |            | 40,000  | -----      | 40,000  |
| (FC) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | 16,000,000 | -----   | 16,000,000 | -----   |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                      | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                               | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| Kansas--Continued                                                                             |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa,<br>Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See<br>Iowa.) |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Perry Reservoir-----                                                                          | \$6, 500, 000                                        | -----      | \$6, 500, 000   | -----      |
| Topeka-----                                                                                   | 4, 500, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 500, 000     | -----      |
| Wilson Reservoir-----                                                                         | 2, 900, 000                                          | -----      | 2, 900, 000     | -----      |
| Kentucky:                                                                                     |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn-----                                                                | 15, 400, 000                                         | -----      | 15, 400, 000    | -----      |
| Booneville Reservoir-----                                                                     |                                                      | \$100, 000 |                 | \$100, 000 |
| Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and<br>Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                              |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam,<br>Kentucky and Ohio-----                              | 6, 365, 000                                          | -----      | 6, 365, 000     | -----      |
| Carr Fork Reservoir-----                                                                      | 830, 000                                             | -----      | 830, 000        | -----      |
| Cave Run Reservoir-----                                                                       | 1, 300, 000                                          | -----      | 1, 300, 000     | -----      |
| Cumberland-----                                                                               | 490, 000                                             | -----      | 490, 000        | -----      |
| Eagle Creek Reservoir-----                                                                    |                                                      | 150, 000   |                 | 150, 000   |
| Fishtrap Reservoir-----                                                                       | 10, 400, 000                                         | -----      | 18, 000, 000    | -----      |
| Frankfort-----                                                                                |                                                      | 130, 000   |                 | 130, 000   |
| Grayson Reservoir-----                                                                        | 4, 200, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 200, 000     | -----      |
| Green River Reservoir-----                                                                    | 4, 000, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 000, 000     | -----      |
| McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indi-<br>ana and Kentucky-----                           | 2, 800, 000                                          | -----      | 2, 800, 000     | -----      |

|      |                                                                                                                     |           |           |           |         |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| (FC) | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                        |           | 150,000   |           | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Red River Reservoir                                                                                                 |           |           |           | 75,000  |
|      | Sturgis floodwall                                                                                                   |           |           |           |         |
|      | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                       |           |           |           |         |
|      | Louisiana:                                                                                                          |           |           |           |         |
| (N)  | Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas | 1,000,000 |           | 1,000,000 |         |
| (N)  | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway                                                                         |           | 800,000   | 800,000   |         |
| (N)  | Calcasieu River and Pass                                                                                            |           | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |         |
| (N)  | Calcasieu River, salt-water barrier                                                                                 |           | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |         |
| (FC) | Campti Clarence levee                                                                                               |           | 500,000   | 500,000   |         |
| (N)  | Freshwater Bayou                                                                                                    |           | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |         |
| (N)  | Mississippi River, gulf outlet                                                                                      |           | 8,750,000 | 8,750,000 |         |
| (FC) | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962) act                                                               |           | 750,000   | 750,000   |         |
|      | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)                                                             |           |           |           |         |
|      | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)                      |           |           |           |         |
|      | Maine:                                                                                                              |           |           |           |         |
| (N)  | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel                                                                                    | 1,700,000 |           | 1,700,000 |         |
|      | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)                                         |           |           |           |         |



| Construction, general, State and project                                                                  | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                                           | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| Maryland:                                                                                                 |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (N) Baltimore Harbor and Channel-----                                                                     |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.-----                                                           | \$3, 300, 000                                        | \$350, 000 | \$3, 300, 000   | \$350, 000 |
| Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.) |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Massachusetts:                                                                                            |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (N) Boston Harbor, Chelsea River-----                                                                     | 550, 000                                             |            | 550, 000        |            |
| (R) Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge-----                                                                    | 500, 000                                             |            | 500, 000        |            |
| (FC) Chicopee Falls-----                                                                                  | 620, 000                                             |            | 620, 000        |            |
| (FC) Conant Brook Reservoir-----                                                                          | 1, 000, 000                                          |            | 1, 000, 000     |            |
| (N) Gloucester Harbor-----                                                                                | 830, 000                                             |            | 830, 000        |            |
| (FC) Littleville Reservoir-----                                                                           | 1, 936, 000                                          |            | 1, 936, 000     | 50, 000    |
| (N) Marblehead Harbor-----                                                                                |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (FC) New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier-----                                                      | 4, 000, 000                                          |            | 4, 000, 000     |            |
| (FC) Three Rivers-----                                                                                    | 435, 000                                             |            | 435, 000        |            |
| (FC) Wareham-Marion-----                                                                                  |                                                      | 100, 000   |                 | 100, 000   |
| (FC) Westfield-----                                                                                       | 300, 000                                             |            | 300, 000        |            |
| Michigan:                                                                                                 |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (R) Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)-----                                                         | 150, 000                                             |            | 150, 000        |            |
| (N) Gladstone Harbor-----                                                                                 | 617, 000                                             |            | 617, 000        |            |
| (N) Great Lakes connecting channels-----                                                                  | 1, 000, 000                                          |            | 1, 000, 000     |            |
| (N) Leland Harbor-----                                                                                    |                                                      |            |                 | 30, 000    |

|                                                                |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| (R)                                                            | Ludington Harbor (north revetment)-----                                                                      | 172,000   | -----   | 172,000   | -----   |
| (R)                                                            | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)-----                                                                    | 500,000   | -----   | 500,000   | -----   |
| (R)                                                            | Marquette Harbor-----                                                                                        | 150,000   | -----   | 150,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | Muskegon Harbor-----                                                                                         | 560,000   | -----   | 560,000   | -----   |
| (R)                                                            | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and<br>revetments)-----                                                 | 150,000   | -----   | 150,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | Ontonagon Harbor-----                                                                                        | -----     | 91,000  | -----     | 91,000  |
| (FC)                                                           | Rouge River-----                                                                                             | -----     | 178,000 | 400,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | St. Marys River: New Poe lock-----                                                                           | 5,500,000 | -----   | 5,500,000 | -----   |
| (FC)                                                           | Saginaw River (flood control)-----                                                                           | 750,000   | -----   | 750,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | Saginaw River (navigation)-----                                                                              | -----     | 120,000 | -----     | 120,000 |
| Minnesota:                                                     |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
| (N)                                                            | Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:<br>Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels                        | 675,000   | -----   | 675,000   | -----   |
| (FC)                                                           | Lost River-----                                                                                              | 250,000   | -----   | 250,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | Minnesota River, 9-foot channel-----                                                                         | 1,000,000 | -----   | 1,000,000 | -----   |
| (R)                                                            | Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi<br>River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron<br>and cutoff walls)----- | 235,000   | -----   | 235,000   | -----   |
| (FC)                                                           | Rushford-----                                                                                                | -----     | 80,000  | -----     | 80,000  |
| (FC)                                                           | St. Paul and South St. Paul-----                                                                             | 600,000   | -----   | 600,000   | -----   |
| (FC)                                                           | Winona-----                                                                                                  | 800,000   | -----   | 800,000   | -----   |
| Mississippi:                                                   |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                        |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
| (FC)                                                           | Jackson and East Jackson-----                                                                                | -----     | -----   | 800,000   | -----   |
| (FC)                                                           | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir-----                                                                               | 500,000   | -----   | 500,000   | -----   |
| (N)                                                            | Pascagoula Harbor-----                                                                                       | 620,000   | -----   | 620,000   | -----   |
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and<br>Miss. (See Alabama.) |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                     | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | House allowance |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                                                                              | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  |
| Missouri:                                                                                    |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (FC) Chariton River-----                                                                     | \$650,000                                         | -----     | \$650,000       | -----     |
| (FC) Hannibal-----                                                                           | -----                                             | \$155,000 | -----           | \$155,000 |
| (MP) Joanna Reservoir-----                                                                   | -----                                             | 434,000   | -----           | 434,000   |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir-----                                                          | -----                                             | -----     | -----           | -----     |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction-----                                    | 1,500,000                                         | -----     | 1,500,000       | -----     |
| (FC) Marion County Drainage District-----                                                    | 1,000,000                                         | -----     | 1,000,000       | -----     |
| Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)-----        | 764,000                                           | -----     | 764,000         | -----     |
| Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)-----    | -----                                             | -----     | -----           | -----     |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)----- | -----                                             | -----     | -----           | -----     |
| (FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3-----                              | 596,000                                           | -----     | 596,000         | -----     |
| (FC) South River Drainage District-----                                                      | 499,000                                           | -----     | 499,000         | -----     |
| (FC) St. Louis-----                                                                          | 10,000,000                                        | -----     | 10,000,000      | -----     |
| (MP) Stockton Reservoir-----                                                                 | 4,000,000                                         | -----     | 4,000,000       | -----     |
| Montana:                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                 |           |
| (MP) Libby Reservoir-----                                                                    | -----                                             | 1,000,000 | -----           | 1,000,000 |

|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |             |          |             |          |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| (FC)<br>(R)  | Nebraska:<br>Gering Valley<br>Harlan County Reservoir (slope protection)<br>Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa,<br>Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See<br>Iowa.)<br>Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa,<br>Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See<br>Iowa.) | 1, 400, 000 | -----    | 1, 400, 000 | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1, 600, 000 | -----    | 1, 600, 000 | -----    |
| (FC)<br>(FC) | Norfolk<br>Salt Creek and tributaries                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 300, 000    | -----    | 300, 000    | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 3, 000, 000 | -----    | 3, 000, 000 | -----    |
| (FC)         | Nevada:<br>Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | -----       | 125, 000 | -----       | 125, 000 |
| (BE)<br>(N)  | New Hampshire:<br>Hampton Beach erosion (reimbursement)<br>Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River,<br>Maine and N.H.                                                                                                                                                     | -----       | -----    | 109, 000    | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1, 500, 000 | -----    | 1, 500, 000 | -----    |
| (R)<br>(N)   | New Jersey:<br>Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)<br>Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchor-<br>ages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Penn-<br>sylvania                                                                                                                         | 488, 000    | -----    | 488, 000    | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 3, 750, 000 | -----    | 3, 750, 000 | -----    |
| (R)<br>(N)   | Manasquan River (bulkheads)<br>Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic<br>Rivers, North Reach Channel                                                                                                                                                                         | 90, 000     | -----    | 90, 000     | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1, 132, 000 | -----    | 1, 132, 000 | -----    |
| (R)          | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shoot-<br>ers Island dike), New York and New<br>Jersey                                                                                                                                                                                 | -----       | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC)<br>(MP) | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays<br>Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 264, 000    | -----    | 264, 000    | -----    |
|              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1, 100, 000 | 450, 000 | 1, 100, 000 | 450, 000 |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                  | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                           | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| New Mexico:                                                                               |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Albuquerque-----                                                                     | \$500, 000                                        |            | \$500, 000      |            |
| (FC) Galisteo Reservoir-----                                                              |                                                   |            | 2, 300, 000     |            |
| (FC) Las Cruces-----                                                                      |                                                   | \$192, 000 |                 | \$192, 000 |
| New York:                                                                                 |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.<br>(See Pennsylvania.)                            |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (N) Buffalo Harbor: Outer harbor—(1962 modification)                                      | 1, 406, 000                                       |            | 1, 406, 000     |            |
| (N) Buttermilk Channel-----                                                               | 1, 300, 000                                       |            | 1, 300, 000     |            |
| (BE) Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)                                          |                                                   |            |                 | 25, 000    |
| (BE) Fire Island Inlet, Long Island-----                                                  | 1, 112, 000                                       |            | 1, 112, 000     |            |
| (FC) Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point-----                                              | 1, 900, 000                                       |            | 1, 900, 000     |            |
| (N) Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway-----                                             | 400, 000                                          |            | 400, 000        |            |
| (N) Hudson River, New York City to Albany-----                                            | 3, 200, 000                                       |            | 3, 200, 000     |            |
| (FC) Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet-----                                                            | 800, 000                                          |            | 800, 000        |            |
| (FC) Lackawanna-----                                                                      | 500, 000                                          |            | 500, 000        |            |
| (FC) Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River-----                                             |                                                   | 100, 000   |                 | 100, 000   |
| (R) Little Sodus Bay (piers)-----                                                         | 215, 000                                          |            | 215, 000        |            |
| New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Nichols-----                                                                         |                                                   | 35, 000    |                 | 35, 000    |
| (N) Oswego Harbor (1962 act)-----                                                         | 300, 000                                          |            | 300, 000        |            |



|      |                                                                                         |            |         |            |         |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | Rosendale-----                                                                          | -----      | -----   | -----      | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Salamanca-----                                                                          | -----      | -----   | -----      | 75,000  |
| (FC) | South Amsterdam-----                                                                    | 378,000    | -----   | 378,000    | -----   |
|      | North Carolina:                                                                         |            |         |            |         |
|      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                 |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection-----                                         | 300,000    | -----   | 300,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | New Hope Reservoir-----                                                                 | -----      | 250,000 | -----      | 250,000 |
| (N)  | Northwest Cape Fear (Sec. 107)-----                                                     | -----      | -----   | 105,200    | -----   |
| (N)  | Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth<br>(1962 act)-----                             | -----      | 67,000  | -----      | 67,000  |
|      | North Dakota:                                                                           |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Bowman Haley Reservoir-----                                                             | 800,000    | -----   | 800,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Res-<br>ervoir-----                                | 800,000    | -----   | 800,000    | -----   |
|      | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See<br>South Dakota.)                              |            |         |            |         |
|      | Ohio:                                                                                   |            |         |            |         |
| (N)  | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia-----                                | 16,500,000 | -----   | 16,500,000 | -----   |
| (FC) | Big Darby Creek Reservoir-----                                                          | 1,000,000  | -----   | 1,000,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Buck Creek Reservoir-----                                                               | -----      | 77,000  | 730,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Caesar Creek Reservoir-----                                                             | -----      | 150,000 | -----      | 150,000 |
|      | Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam,<br>Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)              |            |         | 500,000    | -----   |
| (N)  | Cleveland Harbor (1962 act)-----                                                        | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |
| (N)  | Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, wid-<br>ening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)- | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |
| (N)  | Conneaut Harbor-----                                                                    | 1,800,000  | -----   | 1,800,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Deer Creek Reservoir-----                                                               | 1,000,000  | -----   | 1,000,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | East Fork Reservoir-----                                                                | -----      | -----   | 500,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Empire (restudy)-----                                                                   | -----      | 150,000 | -----      | 150,000 |
|      |                                                                                         |            |         |            | 25,000  |

| Construction, general, State and project                                       | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| Ohio—Continued                                                                 |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Fremont-----                                                              | -----                                                | \$130, 000 | -----           | \$130, 000 |
| (N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia-----                     | -----                                                | 230, 000   | -----           | 230, 000   |
| (N) Lorain Harbor-----                                                         | \$3, 000, 000                                        | -----      | \$3, 000, 000   | -----      |
| (FC) North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir-----                                | -----                                                | 99, 000    | -----           | 99, 000    |
| (FC) Paint Creek Reservoir-----                                                | -----                                                | 116, 000   | -----           | 116, 000   |
| (N) Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia-----                  | 7, 539, 000                                          | -----      | 7, 539, 000     | -----      |
| (N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Vir-<br>ginia-----                     | 6, 200, 000                                          | -----      | 6, 200, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) Salt Creek Reservoir-----                                                 | -----                                                | 200, 000   | -----           | 200, 000   |
| Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.<br>(See Pennsylvania.)-----             | -----                                                | -----      | -----           | -----      |
| (FC) West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River-----                                | 4, 100, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 100, 000     | -----      |
| (N) Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia-----                 | -----                                                | 325, 000   | -----           | 325, 000   |
| (FC) Youngstown, Crab Creek-----                                               | -----                                                | 25, 000    | -----           | 25, 000    |
| Oklahoma:                                                                      |                                                      |            |                 |            |
| Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas<br>and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)----- | -----                                                | 155, 000   | -----           | 155, 000   |
| (FC) Birch Reservoir-----                                                      | -----                                                | -----      | -----           | -----      |
| (MP) Broken Bow Reservoir-----                                                 | 4, 800, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 800, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) Copan Reservoir-----                                                      | -----                                                | 150, 000   | -----           | 150, 000   |
| (MP) Eufaula Reservoir-----                                                    | 3, 000, 000                                          | -----      | 3, 000, 000     | -----      |

|         |                                                                                            |            |            |            |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| (FC)    | Hugo Reservoir                                                                             | 150,000    | 150,000    | 150,000    |
| (FC)    | Kaw Reservoir                                                                              | 200,000    | 200,000    | 200,000    |
| (MP)    | Keystone Reservoir                                                                         | 6,000,000  | 6,000,000  | 6,000,000  |
| (FC)    | Optima Reservoir                                                                           | 162,000    | 162,000    | 162,000    |
| (FC)    | Pine Creek Reservoir                                                                       | 3,500,000  | 3,500,000  | 3,500,000  |
| (MP)    | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam                                               | 6,000,000  | 6,000,000  | 6,000,000  |
| (FC)    | Skiatook Reservoir                                                                         | 225,000    | 225,000    | 225,000    |
| (N)     | Webbers Falls lock and dam                                                                 | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  |
| Oregon: |                                                                                            |            |            |            |
| (FC)    | Applegate Reservoir                                                                        | 2,028,000  | 2,028,000  | 2,028,000  |
| (FC)    | Blue River Reservoir                                                                       |            |            |            |
| (N)     | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  |
| (N)     | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington                                         |            |            |            |
| (R)     | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington                           | 130,000    | 130,000    | 130,000    |
| (N)     | Coos and Millicoma Rivers                                                                  | 1,500,000  | 1,500,000  | 1,500,000  |
| (MP)    | Cougar Reservoir                                                                           | 555,000    | 555,000    | 555,000    |
| (FC)    | Fall Creek Reservoir                                                                       | 585,000    | 585,000    | 585,000    |
| (MP)    | Green Peter Reservoir                                                                      | 8,500,000  | 8,500,000  | 8,500,000  |
| (MP)    | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington                                               | 19,500,000 | 19,500,000 | 19,500,000 |
| (MP)    | Lost Creek Reservoir                                                                       | 72,000,000 | 72,000,000 | 72,000,000 |
| (FC)    | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington                                | 350,000    | 350,000    | 350,000    |
| (FC)    | Shelton Ditch                                                                              | 500,000    | 500,000    | 500,000    |
| (R)     | Tillamook Bay and Harbor                                                                   | 100,000    | 100,000    | 100,000    |
| (FC)    | Willamette River Basin bank protection                                                     | 500,000    | 500,000    | 500,000    |
| (N)     | Yaquina Bay and Harbor                                                                     | 1,700,000  | 1,700,000  | 1,700,000  |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                             | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |          | House allowance |          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|----------|
|                                                                                                                      | Construction                                         | Planning | Construction    | Planning |
| Pennsylvania:                                                                                                        |                                                      |          |                 |          |
| (FC) Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.                                                                         | \$27,000,000                                         |          | \$27,000,000    |          |
| (FC) Aylesworth Creek Reservoir                                                                                      |                                                      | \$80,000 |                 | \$80,000 |
| (FC) Beltzville Reservoir                                                                                            |                                                      | 276,000  |                 | 276,000  |
| (FC) Blanchard Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                      |          | 1,000,000       |          |
| (FC) Blue Marsh Reservoir                                                                                            |                                                      | 100,000  |                 | 100,000  |
| (FC) Butler                                                                                                          | 762,000                                              |          | 762,000         |          |
| (FC) Curwensville Reservoir                                                                                          | 3,200,000                                            |          | 3,200,000       |          |
| (N) Dam 4, Monongahela River                                                                                         | 3,800,000                                            |          | 3,800,000       |          |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchor-<br>ages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsyl-<br>vania. (See New Jersey.) |                                                      |          |                 |          |
| (FC) Elkland                                                                                                         | 800,000                                              |          | 800,000         | 25,000   |
| (N) Erie Harbor (1962 modification)                                                                                  |                                                      |          |                 |          |
| (FC) Latrobe                                                                                                         | 300,000                                              |          | 300,000         |          |
| (N) Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River                                                                         | 5,500,000                                            |          | 5,500,000       |          |
| (FC) Muddy Creek Reservoir                                                                                           |                                                      | 25,000   |                 | 25,000   |
| (FC) Raystown Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                      | 700,000  |                 | 700,000  |
| (FC) Scranton                                                                                                        |                                                      | 45,000   |                 | 45,000   |
| (FC) Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.                                                                          | 11,300,000                                           |          | 11,300,000      | 300,000  |
| (FC) Tioga-Hammond Reservoir                                                                                         |                                                      |          |                 |          |
| (FC) Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See<br>New Jersey.)                                                       |                                                      | 300,000  |                 |          |
| (FC) Turtle Creek                                                                                                    | 4,500,000                                            |          | 4,500,000       |          |



|      |                                            |       |            |       |            |         |
|------|--------------------------------------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | Union City Reservoir                       | ----- | -----      | ----- | -----      | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Woodcock Reservoir                         | ----- | -----      | ----- | -----      | 60,000  |
|      | Rhode Island:                              |       |            |       |            |         |
| (FC) | Fox Point Barrier                          | ----- | 1,857,000  | ----- | 1,857,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Lower Woonsocket                           | ----- | 2,000,000  | ----- | 2,000,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier        | ----- |            |       |            | 65,000  |
| (FC) | Point Judith—Hurricane barrier             | ----- |            |       |            | 120,000 |
| (N)  | Warwick Cove (sec. 107)                    | ----- |            |       | 200,000    | -----   |
|      | South Carolina:                            |       |            |       |            |         |
|      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)    |       |            |       |            |         |
|      | South Dakota:                              |       |            |       |            |         |
| (MP) | Big Bend Reservoir                         | ----- | 14,500,000 | ----- | 14,500,000 | -----   |
| (MP) | Fort Randall Reservoir                     | ----- | 1,270,000  | ----- | 1,270,000  | -----   |
| (MP) | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.        | ----- | 4,000,000  | ----- | 4,000,000  | -----   |
|      | Tennessee:                                 |       |            |       |            |         |
|      | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.) |       |            |       |            |         |
| (MP) | Cordell Hull lock and dam                  | ----- | 7,100,000  | ----- | 8,100,000  | -----   |
| (MP) | J. Percy Priest Reservoir                  | ----- | 8,600,000  | ----- | 10,100,000 | -----   |
| (BA) | Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.   | ----- | 413,000    | ----- | 413,000    | -----   |
|      | Texas:                                     |       |            |       |            |         |
|      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)    |       |            |       |            |         |
| (FC) | Bardwell Reservoir                         | ----- | 6,500,000  | ----- | 6,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Big Fossil Creek                           | ----- | 1,340,000  | ----- | 1,340,000  | -----   |
| (R)  | Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)             | ----- | 750,000    | ----- | 750,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Buffalo Bayou and tributaries              | ----- | 2,900,000  | ----- | 2,900,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Canyon Reservoir                           | ----- | 614,000    | ----- | 614,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension  | ----- | 200,000    | ----- | 200,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension   | ----- | 600,000    | ----- | 600,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Freeport and vicinity                      | ----- | 300,000    | ----- | 300,000    | -----   |
| (R)  | Galveston Harbor (jetties)                 | ----- | 1,800,000  | ----- | 1,800,000  | -----   |



| Construction, general, State and project                                                        | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                                                 | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| Texas—Continued                                                                                 |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (N) Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project                                               | \$500, 000                                        | -----      | \$500, 000      | -----      |
| (N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria                             | 2, 955, 000                                       | -----      | 2, 955, 000     | -----      |
| (N) Houston ship channel (40-foot project)                                                      | 3, 200, 000                                       | -----      | 3, 200, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) Lake Kemp Reservoir                                                                        | -----                                             | \$200, 000 | -----           | \$200, 000 |
| (FC) Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement                                       | -----                                             | 225, 000   | -----           | 225, 000   |
| (N) Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels                                            | 2, 477, 000                                       | -----      | 2, 477, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) Pat Mayse Reservoir                                                                        | -----                                             | 300, 000   | 1, 000, 000     | -----      |
| (N) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola             | 2, 000, 000                                       | -----      | 2, 000, 000     | -----      |
| (R) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jet-ties)                                             | 800, 000                                          | -----      | 800, 000        | -----      |
| (FC) Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)                                      | -----                                             | 389, 000   | -----           | 389, 000   |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) | -----                                             | -----      | -----           | -----      |
| (N) Sabine-Neches waterway (40-foot project)                                                    | -----                                             | -----      | 1, 500, 000     | -----      |
| (MP) Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam                                                               | 5, 600, 000                                       | -----      | 5, 600, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) San Antonio Channel                                                                        | 1, 000, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 000, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River                                                | -----                                             | 400, 000   | -----           | 400, 000   |
| (FC) Somerville Reservoir                                                                       | 5, 200, 000                                       | -----      | 5, 200, 000     | -----      |
| (FC) Stillhouse Hollow Dam                                                                      | 3, 600, 000                                       | -----      | 3, 600, 000     | -----      |

|      |                                                                                                                |              |       |              |       |          |          |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|
| (FC) | Texas City-----                                                                                                | 4, 300, 000  | ----- | 4, 300, 000  | ----- | 99, 000  | -----    |
| (FC) | Vince and Little Vince Bayous-----                                                                             | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | 99, 000  |
| (FC) | Waco Reservoir-----                                                                                            | 6, 326, 000  | ----- | 6, 326, 000  | ----- | -----    | 350, 000 |
| (N)  | Wallisville Reservoir-----                                                                                     | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | 350, 000 | -----    |
|      | Vermont:-----                                                                                                  | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | 20, 000  |
| (FC) | Gaysville Dam (restudy)-----                                                                                   | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | 150, 000 |
|      | Virginia:-----                                                                                                 | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (MP) | Gathright Dam-----                                                                                             | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir-----                                                                       | 5, 000, 000  | ----- | 5, 000, 000  | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (N)  | Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay-----                                                                                   | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | 200, 000 | -----    |
| (FC) | Norfolk-----                                                                                                   | 1, 460, 000  | ----- | 1, 460, 000  | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | North Fork of Pound Reservoir-----                                                                             | 3, 000, 000  | ----- | 3, 000, 000  | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (BE) | Virginia Beach (reimbursement)-----                                                                            | 125, 000     | ----- | 125, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
|      | Washington:-----                                                                                               | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | Colfax-----                                                                                                    | 1, 500, 000  | ----- | 1, 500, 000  | ----- | -----    | -----    |
|      | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)-----                                         | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
|      | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)----- | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (R)  | Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)-----                                                             | 500, 000     | ----- | 500, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
|      | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)-----                                               | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (MP) | Little Goose lock and dam-----                                                                                 | 13, 000, 000 | ----- | 13, 000, 000 | ----- | -----    | -----    |
|      | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)-----                                | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (MP) | Lower Monumental lock and dam-----                                                                             | 37, 500, 000 | ----- | 37, 500, 000 | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | Sannamish River-----                                                                                           | 760, 000     | ----- | 760, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (N)  | Swinomish Slough-----                                                                                          | 790, 000     | ----- | 790, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (N)  | Tacoma Harbor-----                                                                                             | 900, 000     | ----- | 900, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | Washougal area-----                                                                                            | 700, 000     | ----- | 700, 000     | ----- | -----    | -----    |
| (FC) | Wynoochee River Reservoir-----                                                                                 | -----        | ----- | -----        | ----- | 200, 000 | 200, 000 |

| Construction, general, State and project                         | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | House allowance |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                                                  | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction    | Planning   |
| West Virginia:                                                   |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Beech Fork Reservoir                                        |                                                   | \$100, 000 |                 | \$100, 000 |
| Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)    |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)            |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Buckhannon                                                       | \$175, 000                                        |            | \$175, 000      |            |
| (FC) East Lynn Reservoir                                         | 500, 000                                          |            | 500, 000        |            |
| (FC) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Justice Reservoir                                           |                                                   | 650, 000   |                 | 650, 000   |
| Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)    |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (N) Opekiska lock and dam                                        | 4, 800, 000                                       |            | 4, 800, 000     |            |
| Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)        |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Summersville Reservoir                                      | 8, 244, 000                                       |            | 8, 244, 000     |            |
| Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)  |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Wisconsin:                                                       |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)         |                                                   |            |                 |            |
| (FC) Eau Galle River, Spring Valley                              | 400, 000                                          |            | 400, 000        |            |
| (N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)                                  |                                                   | 70, 000    |                 | 70, 000    |

|      |                                                                                                            |               |            |               |            |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| (N)  | Kenosha Harbor-----                                                                                        | 335,000       | -----      | 335,000       | -----      |
| (R)  | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and re-<br>ment)-----                                                          | 150,000       | -----      | 150,000       | -----      |
| (FC) | Kickapoo River-----                                                                                        | -----         | 125,000    | -----         | 125,000    |
| (N)  | Milwaukee Harbor (1935 act)-----                                                                           | 6,000         | -----      | 6,000         | -----      |
| (N)  | Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)-----                                                                           | 400,000       | -----      | 400,000       | -----      |
| (R)  | Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)-----                                                                         | 432,000       | -----      | 432,000       | -----      |
| (N)  | Saxon Harbor-----                                                                                          | -----         | -----      | 200,000       | -----      |
| (R)  | Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal-----                                                                 | 147,000       | -----      | 147,000       | -----      |
|      | Miscellaneous:                                                                                             |               |            |               |            |
| (FC) | Small projects for flood control and related<br>purposes not requiring specific legislation-----           | 6,000,000     | -----      | 5,000,000     | -----      |
| (FC) | Snagging and clearing-----                                                                                 | 250,000       | -----      | 250,000       | -----      |
| (N)  | Small navigation projects not requiring<br>specific legislation costing up to \$200,000-----               | -----         | -----      | -----         | -----      |
| (BE) | Small beach erosion control projects not<br>requiring specific legislation costing up to<br>\$400,000----- | 1,500,000     | -----      | 1,500,000     | -----      |
|      | Recreation facilities, completed projects-----                                                             | 500,000       | -----      | 500,000       | -----      |
|      | Small authorized projects-----                                                                             | 4,000,000     | -----      | 4,795,000     | -----      |
|      | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and<br>Wildlife Service)-----                                         | 1,000,000     | -----      | 1,000,000     | -----      |
| (R)  | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to<br>\$400,000)-----                                            | 500,000       | -----      | 500,000       | -----      |
|      | Employees compensation-----                                                                                | 500,000       | -----      | 500,000       | -----      |
|      | Reduction for anticipated savings and slip-<br>pages-----                                                  | 176,000       | -----      | 176,000       | -----      |
|      |                                                                                                            | -70,000,000   | -----      | -75,000,000   | -----      |
|      | Grand total, construction, general-----                                                                    | 858,639,000   | 20,669,000 | 884,096,200   | 21,671,000 |
|      |                                                                                                            | (879,308,000) |            | (905,767,200) |            |



*Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.*—The \$100,000 appropriated for this project is for the purpose of reviewing and updating the economic evaluation of the waterway in Mississippi and Alabama.

*Oroville Reservoir, California.*—A reduction of \$610,000 has been made in the budget estimate of \$9,000,000. This action is consistent with the reductions made in past years by the Committee in the payments to the State of California for construction costs on the flood control features of the project.

*Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District Number 13, Iowa.*—The funds provided for this project are for the purpose of continuing construction if and when local cooperation agreements have been made satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers.

*Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa.*—The increase provided in this item is for the purpose of moving up the completion date on the section of the river between Council Bluffs and Kansas City.

*Justice Reservoir, West Virginia.*—Funds appropriated for this project beyond the amount necessary to meet the requirements set out in the House and Senate Reports on the 1964 Bill are not to be obligated without further approval of the Committee.

*Small Projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation.*—The reduction of \$1,000,000 made by the Committee in this item represents half of the increase requested over the fiscal year 1964 program. The amount provided will permit work to begin on most, if not all, of the backlog of projects ready for actual construction.

*Recreation facilities at completed projects.*—The increase over the budget of \$795,000 made by the Committee in this item includes \$370,000 for the Berlin reservoir in Ohio and \$425,000 for the Denison reservoir, Oklahoma and Texas.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

|                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$154, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 158, 676, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 158, 676, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                 |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | +4, 676, 000    |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |                 |

The increase in this item is the result of additional projects moving into the operation and maintenance stage.

#### FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE, AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Estimate, 1965.....      | \$4, 150, 000 |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 4, 150, 000   |
| Comparison:              |               |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | +4, 150, 000  |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |               |

This new appropriation item includes funds for the hurricane, flood control, and shore protection functions previously carried under the "Operation and maintenance, general" heading.



## GENERAL EXPENSES

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$15, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 15, 575, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 15, 575, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | +575, 000      |
| Estimate, 1965-----      |                |

The increase in this item above the 1964 level provides principally for the cost of pay act increases.

## FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$77, 862, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 71, 860, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 73, 550, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | -4, 312, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | +1, 690, 000   |

The funds under this heading are distributed to projects and activities as shown in the table which follows:

| Projects                                    | House allowance           |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. General investigations:                  |                           |
| (a) Examinations and surveys-----           | <sup>1</sup> \$90, 000    |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data----- | 85, 000                   |
| Subtotal, general investigations-----       | 175, 000                  |
| 2. Construction:                            |                           |
| Mississippi River levees-----               | 3, 800, 000               |
| Channel improvement-----                    | <sup>1</sup> 26, 165, 000 |
| Memphis Harbor-----                         | 600, 000                  |
| Old River control-----                      | 200, 000                  |
| St. Francis Basin-----                      | 3, 700, 000               |
| West Tennessee tributaries-----             | 1, 400, 000               |
| Lower Arkansas-----                         | 300, 000                  |
| Tensas Basin:                               |                           |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc-----           | 900, 000                  |
| Red River backwater-----                    | 200, 000                  |
| Yazoo Basin:                                |                           |
| Sardis Reservoir-----                       | 70, 000                   |
| Enid Reservoir-----                         | 40, 000                   |
| Arkabutla Reservoir-----                    | 40, 000                   |
| Grenada Reservoir-----                      | 50, 000                   |
| Greenwood-----                              | 700, 000                  |
| Upper auxiliary channels-----               | 100, 000                  |
| Main stem-----                              | 800, 000                  |
| Tributaries-----                            | 1, 600, 000               |
| Big Sunflower River, etc-----               | 650, 000                  |
| Yazoo backwater-----                        | 1, 850, 000               |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries-----         | 300, 000                  |
| Atchafalaya Basin-----                      | 7, 200, 000               |
| Lake Pontchartrain-----                     | 210, 000                  |
| Subtotal-----                               | 50, 875, 000              |

<sup>1</sup> Increase in budget estimate.

| Projects                                             | House allowance |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages..... | —\$1, 500, 000  |
| Subtotal, construction.....                          | 49, 375, 000    |
| 3. Maintenance.....                                  | 24, 000, 000    |
| Grand total.....                                     | 73, 550, 000    |

The amount allowed includes approval of the budgeted program and an increase above the budget estimate for the following:

*Examinations and Surveys*—Rapides and Avoyelles Parishes, Flood Control study, \$25,000.

*Channel Improvement*—Memphis Reach, \$665,000, and Terreine Landing Revetment, \$1,000,000.

In connection with the Yazoo Basin project, the Committee directs that the minimum of land necessary for flood control be taken in the acquisition proceedings for the Hillside floodway.

## PANAMA CANAL

### CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$25, 725, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 29, 088, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 29, 088, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | +3, 363, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |                |

The appropriations which finance this operation are repaid annually to the Treasury through recoveries of the Agency's services in Canal operations, and other revenues, by the Panama Canal Company. The principal increases above the 1964 appropriation level are for the educational system and for hospitals and clinics.

#### CAPITAL OUTLAY

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$6, 500, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 4, 821, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 4, 821, 000   |
| Comparison:              |               |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | —1, 679, 000  |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |               |

The budgeted reduction under this heading represents a substantial effort to hold the construction program to the minimum necessary for efficient operation of the physical plant. The Committee is gratified to recognize the effort which is being made in this direction.

## PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

## LIMITATION ON GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

The increase of \$1,354,000 in this limitation over the 1964 level is primarily for additional personnel and associated costs of travel, recruitment and pay act increases.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$10, 294, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 10, 500, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 10, 354, 000   |
| Comparison:         |                |
| Appropriation, 1964 | +60, 000       |
| Estimate, 1965      | —146, 000      |

*Alaska Investigations.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$146,000 in the budget estimate. The amount provided is the same as for the fiscal year 1964. Included in the reduction is \$74,000 budgeted for the Wood Canyon project. The Committee has several times made reference to the need for new authorization for Bureau work in Alaska. It does not intend to continually increase the level of this program without authorization review and amendment by the legislative committee.

The reprogramming proposal to apply \$56,000 of available funds to the Palmdale, California project has been approved.

## CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

|                     |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$185, 431, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 182, 024, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 182, 433, 000   |
| Comparison:         |                 |
| Appropriation, 1964 | —2, 998, 000    |
| Estimate, 1965      | +409, 000       |

The following projects and activities funded under this heading are shown in the table below:

| State and project                                                           | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1965<br>(as amended) |                     | Amount allowed by House,<br>fiscal year 1965 |                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                             | Construction                                      | Advance<br>planning | Construction                                 | Advance<br>planning |
| Arizona:                                                                    |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Gila project-----                                                           | \$1, 190, 000                                     | -----               | \$1, 190, 000                                | -----               |
| Colorado River front work and levee system-----                             | 4, 265, 000                                       | -----               | 4, 665, 000                                  | -----               |
| Parker-Davis project-----                                                   | 1, 482, 000                                       | -----               | 1, 482, 000                                  | -----               |
| California:                                                                 |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Central Valley project-----                                                 | 55, 546, 000                                      | -----               | 55, 280, 000                                 | -----               |
| Colorado River front work and levee system. (See<br>Arizona.)               |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)                                        |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Washoe project, initial phase. (See Nevada.)                                |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Colorado: Fryingpan-Arkansas project-----                                   | 6, 200, 000                                       | -----               | 6, 200, 000                                  | -----               |
| Idaho: Mann Creek-----                                                      | 725, 000                                          | -----               | 725, 000                                     | -----               |
| Kansas: Wichita project, Cheney division-----                               | 1, 480, 000                                       | -----               | 1, 480, 000                                  | -----               |
| Nevada:                                                                     |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)                                        |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Washoe project, initial phase-----                                          |                                                   | \$200, 000          |                                              | \$200, 000          |
| Oklahoma:                                                                   |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Arbuckle project-----                                                       | 3, 500, 000                                       | -----               | 3, 500, 000                                  | -----               |
| Norman project-----                                                         | 3, 221, 000                                       | -----               | 3, 221, 000                                  | -----               |
| Oregon:                                                                     |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Baker project, upper division-----                                          | 700, 000                                          | -----               | 700, 000                                     | -----               |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate<br>Dam and Reservoir----- | 400, 000                                          | -----               | 400, 000                                     | -----               |
| The Dalles project, western division-----                                   | 2, 393, 800                                       | -----               | 2, 393, 800                                  | -----               |

|                                                          |               |               |          |          |          |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Texas:                                                   |               |               |          |          |          |
| Canadian River project-----                              | 22, 100, 000  | 22, 100, 000  | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, La Feria division-----  | 783, 000      | 783, 000      | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, Mercedes division-----  | 775, 000      | 775, 000      | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Utah: Weber Basin project-----                           | 7, 786, 000   | 7, 786, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Washington:                                              |               |               |          |          |          |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit-----    | 400, 000      | 400, 000      | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Columbia Basin project-----                              | 6, 800, 000   | 6, 800, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Spokane Valley project-----                              | 1, 918, 000   | 1, 918, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Wyoming: Riverton project-----                           | 1, 300, 000   | 1, 300, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Various:                                                 |               |               |          |          |          |
| Drainage and minor construction program-----             | 1, 412, 964   | 1, 412, 964   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects-----  | 4, 544, 251   | 4, 144, 251   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Subtotal, exclusive of Missouri River Basin project----- | 128, 922, 015 | 128, 656, 015 | 200, 000 | 200, 000 | 200, 000 |
| MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT                             |               |               |          |          |          |
| Colorado: Narrows unit, South Platte division-----       | -----         | -----         | 135, 000 | -----    | 35, 000  |
| Kansas:                                                  |               |               |          |          |          |
| Almena unit-----                                         | 1, 350, 000   | 2, 200, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Glen Elder unit-----                                     | 8, 400, 000   | 8, 400, 000   | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Wilson unit-----                                         | -----         | -----         | 45, 000  | -----    | 45, 000  |
| Montana:                                                 |               |               |          |          |          |
| Cracker Box, Marsh and Stipek units-----                 | -----         | -----         | 105, 000 | -----    | 105, 000 |
| East Bench unit-----                                     | 780, 000      | 780, 000      | -----    | -----    | -----    |
| Jefferson and Whitehall units, Three Forks division----- | -----         | -----         | 15, 000  | -----    | 15, 000  |
| West Bench unit, Three Forks division-----               | -----         | -----         | 25, 000  | -----    | 25, 000  |
| Yellowtail unit-----                                     | 19, 950, 000  | 19, 950, 000  | -----    | -----    | -----    |



| State and project                                                          | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1965<br>(as amended) |                     | Amount allowed by House,<br>fiscal year 1965 |                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                            | Construction                                      | Advance<br>planning | Construction                                 | Advance<br>planning |
| MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT--Continued                                    |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Nebraska:                                                                  |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Ainsworth unit-----                                                        | \$6, 500, 000                                     |                     | \$6, 500, 000                                |                     |
| Cedar Rapids division-----                                                 |                                                   | \$50, 000           |                                              | \$50, 000           |
| Farwell unit-----                                                          | 2, 700, 000                                       |                     | 2, 700, 000                                  |                     |
| Frenchman-Cambridge division-----                                          | 665, 000                                          |                     | 665, 000                                     |                     |
| North Dakota:                                                              |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Garrison diversion unit, initial stage-----                                |                                                   | 60, 945             |                                              | 60, 945             |
| South Dakota:                                                              |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Oahe unit-----                                                             |                                                   | 402, 055            |                                              | 402, 055            |
| Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, South<br>Dakota pumping division----- |                                                   | 15, 000             |                                              | 15, 000             |
| Wyoming:                                                                   |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Kaycee unit, Powder division-----                                          |                                                   | 97, 000             |                                              | 97, 000             |
| Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)                                            |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Various:                                                                   |                                                   |                     |                                              |                     |
| Transmission division-----                                                 | 22, 175, 000                                      |                     | 22, 175, 000                                 |                     |
| Drainage and minor construction-----                                       | 1, 915, 000                                       |                     | 1, 915, 000                                  |                     |
| Subtotal, construction and advance planning<br>(MRB)-----                  | 64, 435, 000                                      | 950, 000            | 65, 285, 000                                 | 850, 000            |

|                                                          |             |         |             |         |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| Investigations-----                                      | 1,743,000   | -----   | 1,668,000   | -----   |
| Other department agencies-----                           | 3,349,000   | -----   | 3,349,000   | -----   |
| Total, Missouri River Basin project-----                 | 69,527,000  | 950,000 | 70,302,000  | 850,000 |
| Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation-----           | 199,599,015 |         | 200,008,015 |         |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays----- | —17,575,015 |         | —17,575,015 |         |
| Total, construction and rehabilitation-----              | 182,024,000 |         | 182,433,000 |         |

*Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona.*—The additional \$400,000 which the Committee has provided for this project is for additional wells and conveyance channels in the South Gila valley.

*Central Valley Project, California.*—The reduction of \$266,000 made by the Committee in this project estimate is due to the elimination of proposed additional bays at Folsom Switchyard for the Pacific Gas and Electric and Roseville interconnection.

With respect to the San Luis project, it is the Committee's understanding that negotiations are moving to a conclusion on a wheeling contract with Pacific Gas and Electric Company which will make unnecessary certain transmission lines and associated facilities budgeted for Federal construction. The amount of \$2,300,000 which is budgeted for these purposes has been allowed in the amount appropriated for the San Luis Unit with the understanding that it will be used only for the purpose of implementing the wheeling agreement.

The amount provided includes \$15,000 for the Lewis Creek Water District.

*Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.*—The reduction of \$400,000 made under this heading is the result of delays in work on the All-American Canal, Coachella Division, California due to late validation in fiscal year 1964 of the repayment contract.

*Missouri River Basin Project.*—The reduction of \$100,000 made in the Narrows Unit, Colorado estimate is the result of a delay in reaching agreement as to the reservoir site.

The reduction of \$75,000 in the Investigations item is to be applied to the Glendo Unit, Wyoming investigation and results from delays due to water rights problems.

The increase of \$850,000 provided for the Almena, Kans., unit is for starting construction on the irrigation features.

*Denver Office Building.*—The Committee directs that \$2,650,000 of available funds under the "Construction and rehabilitation" heading be transferred to the General Services Administration to begin construction of the new Denver office building for the Bureau of Reclamation which has already been designed.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$38, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 40, 219, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 40, 219, 000   |
| Comparison:         |                |
| Appropriation, 1964 | +2, 219, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965      |                |

The increase over the 1964 level is the result of completion of additional facilities which are moving into the operation and maintenance category.

#### LOAN PROGRAM

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$12, 367, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 12, 307, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 12, 307, 000   |
| Comparisons:        |                |
| Appropriation, 1964 | —60, 000       |
| Estimate, 1965      |                |

The funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

| State and project                           | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1965 (as amended), and House allowance |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Arizona: Roosevelt Irrigation District..... | \$555, 000                                                          |
| California:                                 |                                                                     |
| Arvin-Edison Water Storage District.....    | 8, 000, 000                                                         |
| Banta-Carbona Irrigation District.....      | 230, 000                                                            |
| Broadview Water District.....               | 1, 140, 000                                                         |
| Eastern Municipal Water District.....       | 44, 338                                                             |
| Jackson Valley Irrigation District.....     | 1, 023, 000                                                         |
| South San Joaquin Irrigation District.....  | 648, 000                                                            |
| Idaho:                                      |                                                                     |
| King Hill Irrigation District.....          | 258, 000                                                            |
| St. John Irrigation Co.....                 | 687, 000                                                            |
| Utah: Hooper Irrigation District.....       | 572, 000                                                            |
| Administration of loan program.....         | 132, 662                                                            |
| Prior-year funds available.....             | —983, 000                                                           |
| Total, loan program.....                    | 12, 307, 000                                                        |

#### UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$97, 989, 200 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 62, 300, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 62, 300, 000   |
| Comparisons:             |                |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | —35, 689, 200  |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |                |

The projects and activities funded under this heading are distributed as follows:

| State and project                                        | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1965 (as amended) and House allowance |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
|                                                          | Construction                                                       | Advance planning |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT                           |                                                                    |                  |
| Arizona: Glen Canyon unit.....                           | \$7,700,000                                                        | -----            |
| Colorado: Curecanti unit.....                            | 17,745,000                                                         | -----            |
| Various: Transmission division.....                      | 21,919,000                                                         | -----            |
| PARTICIPATING PROJECTS                                   |                                                                    |                  |
| Colorado:                                                |                                                                    |                  |
| San Juan-Chama participating project.....                | 7,000,000                                                          | -----            |
| Silt participating project.....                          | 3,027,000                                                          | -----            |
| Utah:                                                    |                                                                    |                  |
| Central Utah participating project, initial phase.....   |                                                                    | \$1,330,000      |
| Emery County participating project.....                  | 4,433,000                                                          | -----            |
| Wyoming:                                                 |                                                                    |                  |
| Lyman participating project.....                         | 1,000,000                                                          | -----            |
| Seedskaadee participating project.....                   | 1,051,000                                                          | -----            |
| Various:                                                 |                                                                    |                  |
| Drainage and minor construction....                      | 371,272                                                            | -----            |
| Quality of water.....                                    |                                                                    | 75,000           |
| Subtotal.....                                            | 64,246,272                                                         | 1,405,000        |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays..... | -7,884,272                                                         |                  |
| Subtotal, advance planning and construction.....         | 57,767,000                                                         |                  |
| Operation and maintenance:                               |                                                                    |                  |
| Colorado River storage project.....                      | 32,000                                                             | -----            |
| Participating projects.....                              | 1,000                                                              | -----            |
| Subtotal, operation and maintenance.....                 | 33,000                                                             | -----            |
| Total, Upper Colorado River Basin fund.....              | 57,800,000                                                         |                  |



| State and project                                | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1965 (as amended) and House allowance |                  |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
|                                                  | Construction                                                       | Advance planning |
| RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES    |                                                                    |                  |
| National Park Service-----                       | \$3, 200, 000                                                      | -----            |
| Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife--         | 1, 300, 000                                                        | -----            |
| Total, recreational and fish and wildlife-----   | 4, 500, 000                                                        | -----            |
| Total, upper Colorado River storage project----- | 62, 300, 000                                                       | -----            |

Run-off of the Colorado River is expected to be substantially below average which will reduce anticipated revenues to be derived from the sale of water and power. These revenues are available and programmed for operation and maintenance including the purchase of power. The Committee approves the use of not to exceed \$3,200,000 of construction funds appropriated to the Upper Colorado River Basin fund for operation and maintenance, including the purchase of replacement power, to the extent actual revenues are deficient for this purpose.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$10, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 10, 400, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 10, 400, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | +400, 000      |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | -----          |

The increase above the 1964 appropriation level is primarily due to pay act costs.

#### BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

##### CONSTRUCTION

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$36, 204, 000 |
| Estimated, 1965-----     | 43, 820, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 41, 220, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | +5, 016, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | -2, 600, 000   |

The Committee has disallowed the \$1,000,000 budgeted for planning of a 490 mile high voltage transmission line (item 183), which, with related facilities, could ultimately cost \$132,000,000, from the Bonneville system into southern Idaho. It directs that no funds be expended for any other purpose than for good faith negotiations to be

continued or initiated with interested parties to wheel Bonneville power to serve preference customers only in the southern Idaho federal marketing area. The Committee is confident that further negotiation efforts can be made. If no satisfactory wheeling arrangements can be reported to the Committee by the time of its action on the fiscal year 1966 budget estimates, it will invite a further proposal for federal construction.

The Committee has made an additional reduction of \$1,600,000 in the budgeted amount of \$13,400,000 for reductions due to delays and slippages.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$13, 500, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 14, 980, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 14, 980, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | + 1, 480, 000  |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |                |

Increases in the level of this appropriation continue to be necessary as a result of additional lines and facilities moving out of the construction stage and into operation.

### SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$1, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 1, 000, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 1, 000, 000   |

Revenues of the Southeastern Power Administration are estimated at \$24,500,000 in 1965.

### SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

#### CONSTRUCTION

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$3, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 2, 770, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 2, 610, 000   |
| Comparison:              |               |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | — 390, 000    |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | — 160, 000    |

The Committee has eliminated the funds programmed for the Carthage, Missouri—Coffeyville, Kansas, transmission line. This action is taken on the basis of testimony that the two cities, which would be principal beneficiaries of service from this line, are in a position to provide for interchange of generation capacity which would relieve the need of additional service from another source.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$1, 500, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 1, 680, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 1, 680, 000   |
| Comparison:              |               |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | + 180, 000    |
| Estimate, 1965.....      |               |

Revenues of the Southwestern Power Administration are estimated at \$12,900,000 in fiscal year 1965.

## TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

## OPERATING EXPENSES

|                          |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964..... | \$2, 342, 669, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | 2, 323, 000, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965.....   | 2, 261, 073, 000   |
| Comparison:              |                    |
| Appropriation, 1964..... | —81, 596, 000      |
| Estimate, 1965.....      | —61, 927, 000      |

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

| Program                                                   | Budget estimate  | Recommended by the committee | Change from budget estimate |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Raw materials.....                                        | \$267, 455, 000  | \$267, 455, 000              | -----                       |
| Special nuclear materials.....                            | 401, 500, 000    | 395, 000, 000                | —\$6, 500, 000              |
| Weapons.....                                              | 771, 747, 000    | 765, 000, 000                | —6, 747, 000                |
| Reactor development.....                                  | 497, 900, 000    | 490, 000, 000                | —7, 900, 000                |
| Physical research.....                                    | 222, 000, 000    | 210, 000, 000                | —12, 000, 000               |
| Biology and medicine.....                                 | 80, 000, 000     | 78, 000, 000                 | —2, 000, 000                |
| Training, education, and information.....                 | 17, 700, 000     | 15, 700, 000                 | —2, 000, 000                |
| Isotopes development program.....                         | 10, 300, 000     | 9, 300, 000                  | —1, 000, 000                |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives.....          | 11, 000, 000     | 11, 000, 000                 | -----                       |
| Community program.....                                    | 9, 035, 000      | 9, 035, 000                  | -----                       |
| Program direction and administration.....                 | 76, 780, 000     | 76, 000, 000                 | —780, 000                   |
| Security investigation program.....                       | 7, 000, 000      | 7, 000, 000                  | -----                       |
| Cost of work for others.....                              | 5, 100, 000      | 5, 100, 000                  | -----                       |
| Change in selected resources.....                         | —18, 451, 000    | —21, 451, 000                | —3, 000, 000                |
| Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources..... | —36, 066, 000    | —36, 066, 000                | -----                       |
| Unobligated balance brought forward.....                  |                  | —20, 000, 000                | —20, 000, 000               |
| Total.....                                                | 2, 323, 000, 000 | 2, 261, 073, 000             | —61, 927, 000               |

The total reduction of \$61,927,000 recommended by the Committee includes a net reduction of \$7,965,000 made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in its action on the authorizing legislation.

*Special nuclear materials.*—The reduction of \$6,500,000 made by the Committee in this item is based on recent years' experience which show considerable underruns in costs as compared with the estimates in the budget presentation. For example, cost underruns were \$41,000,000 in 1962, \$31,200,000 in 1963, and are estimated at \$8,000,000 in 1964. The Committee is confident that the reduction made here will not impair the program and can be reasonably anticipated on the basis of this underrun experience.

*Weapons.*—The reduction of \$6,747,000 made in this program is based on underrun experience similar to that in the special nuclear materials program. In the current year costs will underrun appropriations by \$9,000,000, or more.

*Reactor Development.*—In its consideration of this program, the Committee has effected all of the changes made by the authorizing Committee which result in a net increase of \$35,000. A reduction of \$1,500,000 was made by the Joint Committee in the PLUTO program. The Committee has applied an additional \$5,500,000 reduction in this program. The Atomic Energy Commission announced a successful full-powered ground test of the Tory II-C reactor, the second in the PLUTO program, on May 22, 1964. It is the Committee's opinion that this amply demonstrates the successfulness of the ramjet propulsion reactor power plant. Since there is still no military system or requirement for this powerplant and no engine system or vehicle to carry it has been developed up to this time, the Committee sees no reason why further development and testing work is necessary. The \$1,000,000 which has been allowed for this program is for the purpose of "moth-balling" the project until such time as there is a military system and requirement for it. The additional reduction of \$900,000 made by the Committee will be readily absorbed on the basis of past experience with estimate underruns.

*Physical research.*—The reduction made by the Committee in this program includes \$4,000,000 recommended by the authorizing committee and an additional \$8,000,000, representing approximately the increases in the budgeted programs not affected by the Joint Committee, exclusive of increases necessary for the operation of new accelerators and related activities. The amount provided includes the additional \$500,000 authorized by the Joint Committee for the Midwestern Universities Research Association.



This program has grown from \$121,000,000 in 1960 to \$210,000,000 allowed for 1965, approximately \$20,000,000 per year. For the third consecutive year the Committee would like to reiterate the admonition that there be a tightening up in the process of selecting areas and subjects of research undertakings with greater emphasis on overall usefulness of the potential results. It aligns itself completely with the position of the Joint Committee as expressed in its report on the authorizing bill with respect to the high energy physics program.

*Biology and medicine.*—The reduction of \$2,000,000 made by the Committee in this program represents approximately one half of the increases budgeted for actual program activities. It includes the \$1,000,000 reduction made by the authorizing committee. The so-called "cost-of-living" increases have been allowed. Experience with cost underruns in the past would indicate that much of this reduction will be readily absorbed without serious effect on the program. This program has increased from \$45,700,000 in 1960 to \$78,000,000 recommended for 1965.

*Training, education and information.*—The reduction of \$2,000,000 in the budget estimate for this program includes \$1,500,000 effected by the authorizing committee. In addition, the Committee has made a reduction of \$500,000 including \$300,000 of the proposed increase for the information program and \$200,000 for the Argonne, Illinois, school. The information program reduction is taken in light of the President's directive to all agencies to increase efforts to restrict and limit their reporting activities. The \$200,000 at the school is made on the basis of testimony that this is no longer an institute for training foreign nationals. Further, it is the Committee's opinion that the growing capabilities in our regular educational institutions are putting them in position to meet the requirements for training U.S. citizens.

*Isotopes development program.*—The reduction in this item includes \$500,000 made by the authorizing committee. The additional reduction of \$500,000 recommended brings the total reduction to approximately one half of the increase requested. The Committee is in complete accord with the position of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to the effect that there appears to be a number of projects of a continuing nature in the program which could well be carried out by private industry.

*Civilian applications of nuclear explosives.*—The funds provided for this program together with \$1,080,000 provided to the Corps of Engineers should be adequate to continue this program at a reasonable rate.

*Program direction and administration.*—The minor reduction of \$780,000 made in this item should be readily absorbed in a program of the magnitude being considered.

*Change in selected resources.*—The reduction in this item effects a \$2,000,000 reduction made by the Joint Committee in the authorizing legislation and an additional \$1,000,000 reduction made by the Committee.



*Unobligated balance.*—The additional general reduction of \$20,000,000 is based on the latest analysis of the anticipated fund situation as of the end of the current fiscal year.

#### PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

|                     |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$400, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 370, 000, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 363, 000, 000   |
| Comparison:         |                 |
| Appropriation, 1964 | —37, 000, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965      | —7, 000, 000    |

The reduction of \$7,000,000 in this item includes a \$3,000,000 reduction in the authorization bill which was based on the reductions made by the authorizing Committee. The Committee has applied an additional \$4,000,000 in the item "capital equipment not related to construction" to conform in general with the additional reductions it has made in the operating programs.

### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$47, 142, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 50, 915, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 47, 915, 000   |
| Comparison:         |                |
| Appropriation, 1964 | +773, 000      |
| Estimate, 1965      | —3, 000, 000   |

The reduction made by the Committee in this program includes \$1,000,000 of the \$6,000,000 budgeted for the "Between the Lakes Recreation Area." The Committee expects the TVA to use all possible care to maintain good public relations in the land acquisition program. A general reduction of \$2,000,000 has also been made which should be readily offset by unobligated balances at the end of the current fiscal year.

#### DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                     |           |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Appropriation, 1964 | \$38, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965      | 39, 000   |
| Recommended, 1965   | 39, 000   |
| Comparison:         |           |
| Appropriation, 1964 | +1, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965      |           |

The increase above the 1964 level in this program is to cover pay act increases and travel costs.

## CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

|                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$117, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 92, 000    |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 92, 000    |
| Comparison:              |            |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | -25, 000   |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | -----      |

Funds appropriated under this heading represent the United States share of the cost of operating the Delaware River Basin Commission as provided for in the legislation establishing the Commission. The bulk of the costs are carried by the contributing states.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964----- | \$30, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | 5, 000, 000    |
| Recommended, 1965-----   | 4, 000, 000    |
| Comparison:              |                |
| Appropriation, 1964----- | -26, 000, 000  |
| Estimate, 1965-----      | -1, 000, 000   |

Funds allowed under this heading are for the purposes of terminating this program in fiscal year 1965 and include \$1,130,000 for contingencies and \$2,870,000 for administrative expenses. None of the funds budgeted are for the purpose of undertaking additional projects. It is the Committee's opinion that this reduction, which has been made in the contingency item, can be realized in the closing out costs. The full request for administrative expenses has been allowed.

## TITLE V

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS

This section of the bill carries provisions applicable to all appropriation bills for fiscal 1965. They are placed in this bill rather than repeating them in each separate bill and are the same as last year.

## LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 5, in connection with Flood Control, Hurricane and Shore Protection Emergencies, Corps of Engineers:

*Provided, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with this appropriation.*

On page 7, in connection with Operating Expenses, Canal Zone Government, The Panama Canal:

*; maintaining and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use;*

On page 8, in connection with Capital Outlay, Canal Zone Government, The Panama Canal:

*; improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use:*

On page 9, in connection with the Corporation, Panama Canal Company:

*, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.*

On page 11, in connection with Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior:

*Provided further, That no funds shall be made available under this appropriation for the construction in Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of the interceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit which terminates at any point east of Port Chicago.*

On page 23, in connection with Plant and Capital Equipment, Atomic Energy Commission:

*Provided, That not to exceed \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrangement for construction of all or a part of such plant by private industry.*

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATION FOR 1964 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED  
IN THE BILL FOR 1965

| Item                                                              | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimates,<br>1965 (as amended) | Recommended in<br>bill, 1965 | Bill compared with—  |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                   |                      |                                        |                              | Appropriations, 1964 | Estimates, 1965 |
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF<br>DEFENSE—CIVIL                            |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY                                            |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                 |
| CEMETERIAL EXPENSES                                               |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                 |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                        | \$10, 800, 000       | \$13, 295, 000                         | \$13, 295, 000               | +\$2, 495, 000       | -----           |
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL                                          |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                 |
| General investigation-----                                        | 19, 115, 000         | 1 19, 795, 000                         | 20, 590, 000                 | +1, 475, 000         | +\$795, 000     |
| Construction, general-----                                        | 827, 146, 500        | 2 879, 308, 000                        | 905, 767, 200                | +78, 620, 700        | +26, 459, 200   |
| Operation and maintenance, general-----                           | 154, 000, 000        | 158, 676, 000                          | 158, 676, 000                | +4, 676, 000         | -----           |
| Flood control, hurricane and shore protection<br>emergencies----- | (3)                  | 4, 150, 000                            | 4, 150, 000                  | +4, 150, 000         | -----           |
| General expenses-----                                             | 15, 000, 000         | 15, 575, 000                           | 15, 575, 000                 | +575, 000            | -----           |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tribu-<br>taries-----        | 77, 862, 000         | 71, 860, 000                           | 73, 550, 000                 | --4, 312, 000        | +1, 690, 000    |
| U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board<br>of Engineers----- | 10, 000              | -----                                  | -----                        | —10, 000             | -----           |
| Total, rivers and harbors and flood<br>control-----               | 1, 093, 133, 500     | 1, 149, 364, 000                       | 1, 178, 308, 200             | +85, 174, 700        | +28, 944, 200   |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

## Comparative statement of appropriation for 1964 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

| Item                                                                        | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimates,<br>1965 (as amended) | Recommended in<br>bill, 1965 | Bill compared with—  |                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
|                                                                             |                      |                                        |                              | Appropriations, 1964 | Estimates, 1965  |
| <b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF<br/>DEFENSE—CIVIL—Continued</b>                    |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                  |
| <b>THE PANAMA CANAL</b>                                                     |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                  |
| Canal Zone Government:                                                      |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                  |
| Operating expenses-----                                                     | \$25, 725, 000       | <sup>1</sup> \$29, 088, 000            | \$29, 088, 000               | + \$3, 363, 000      | -----            |
| Capital outlay-----                                                         | 6, 500, 000          | 4, 821, 000                            | 4, 821, 000                  | - 1, 679, 000        | -----            |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on<br>general administrative expenses----- | (9, 285, 000)        | (10, 639, 000)                         | (10, 639, 000)               | (+ 1, 354, 000)      | -----            |
| Total, the Panama Canal-----                                                | 32, 225, 000         | 33, 909, 000                           | 33, 909, 000                 | + 1, 684, 000        | -----            |
| Total, title I-----                                                         | 1, 136, 158, 500     | 1, 196, 568, 000                       | 1, 225, 512, 200             | + \$9, 353, 700      | + \$28, 944, 200 |
| <b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE<br/>INTERIOR</b>                              |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                  |
| <b>BUREAU OF RECLAMATION</b>                                                |                      |                                        |                              |                      |                  |
| General investigations-----                                                 | 10, 294, 000         | 10, 500, 000                           | 10, 354, 000                 | + 60, 000            | - 146, 000       |
| Construction and rehabilitation-----                                        | 185, 431, 000        | <sup>4</sup> 182, 024, 000             | 182, 433, 000                | - 2, 998, 000        | + 409, 000       |
| Operation and maintenance-----                                              | 38, 000, 000         | <sup>5</sup> 40, 219, 000              | 40, 219, 000                 | + 2, 219, 000        | -----            |
| (Indefinite appropriation of receipts)-----                                 | (4, 020, 000)        | (4, 269, 000)                          | (4, 269, 000)                | (+ 249, 000)         | -----            |



|                                                             |             |              |             |              |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| Loan program.....                                           | 12,367,000  | 4 12,307,000 | 12,307,000  | -60,000      | -----      |
| Upper Colorado River storage project.....                   | 97,989,200  | 62,300,000   | 62,300,000  | --35,689,200 | -----      |
| General administrative expenses.....                        | 10,000,000  | 10,400,000   | 10,400,000  | +400,000     | -----      |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....                           | 354,081,200 | 317,750,000  | 318,013,000 | -36,068,200  | +263,000   |
| BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION                             |             |              |             |              |            |
| Construction.....                                           | 36,204,000  | 43,820,000   | 41,220,000  | +5,016,000   | -2,600,000 |
| Operation and maintenance.....                              | 13,500,000  | 14,980,000   | 14,980,000  | +1,480,000   | -----      |
| Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....                 | 49,704,000  | 58,800,000   | 56,200,000  | +4,496,000   | -2,600,000 |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION                           |             |              |             |              |            |
| Operation and maintenance.....                              | 1,000,000   | 1,000,000    | 1,000,000   | -----        | -----      |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION                           |             |              |             |              |            |
| Construction.....                                           | 3,000,000   | 2,770,000    | 2,610,000   | -390,000     | -160,000   |
| Operation and maintenance.....                              | 1,500,000   | 1,680,000    | 1,680,000   | +180,000     | -----      |
| Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)..... | (4,500,000) | (4,500,000)  | (4,500,000) | -----        | -----      |
| Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....               | 4,500,000   | 4,450,000    | 4,290,000   | -210,000     | -160,000   |
| Total, title II.....                                        | 409,285,200 | 382,000,000  | 379,503,000 | -29,782,200  | -2,497,000 |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

*Comparative statement of appropriation for 1964 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued*

| Item                                                                                   | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended) | Recommended in bill, 1965 | Bill compared with—  |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                        |                      |                                     |                           | Appropriations, 1964 | Estimates, 1965 |
| TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION                                                     |                      |                                     |                           |                      |                 |
| Operating expenses-----                                                                | \$2, 342, 669, 000   | \$2, 323, 000, 000                  | \$2, 261, 073, 000        | —\$81, 596, 000      | —\$61, 927, 000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts-----                                              | (31, 574, 000)       | (36, 066, 000)                      | (36, 066, 000)            | (+4, 492, 000)       | -----           |
| Plant and capital equipment-----                                                       | 400, 000, 000        | 370, 000, 000                       | 363, 000, 000             | —37, 000, 000        | —7, 000, 000    |
| Total, Title III, Atomic Energy Commission-----                                        | 2, 742, 669, 000     | 2, 693, 000, 000                    | 2, 624, 073, 000          | —118, 596, 000       | —68, 927, 000   |
| TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES                                                           |                      |                                     |                           |                      |                 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expense----- | (429, 000)           | (450, 000)                          | (450, 000)                | (+21, 000)           | -----           |
| Tennessee Valley Authority-----                                                        | 47, 142, 000         | 50, 915, 000                        | 47, 915, 000              | +773, 000            | —3, 000, 000    |
| Delaware River Basin Commission:                                                       |                      |                                     |                           |                      |                 |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                                             | 38, 000              | 39, 000                             | 39, 000                   | +1, 000              | -----           |
| Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission-----                               | 117, 000             | 92, 000                             | 92, 000                   | —25, 000             | -----           |
| Total, Delaware River Basin Commission-----                                            | 155, 000             | 131, 000                            | 131, 000                  | —24, 000             | -----           |

|                                         |               |               |               |             |             |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT     |               |               |               |             |             |
| Public works acceleration-----          | 30,000,000    | 5,000,000     | 4,000,000     | -26,000,000 | -1,000,000  |
| Total, title IV—Independent offices---- | 77,297,000    | 56,046,000    | 52,046,000    | -25,251,000 | -4,000,000  |
| Grand totals:                           |               |               |               |             |             |
| Total, definite appropriations-----     | 4,365,409,700 | 4,327,614,000 | 4,281,134,200 | -84,275,500 | -46,479,800 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations-----   | 40,094,000    | 44,835,000    | 44,835,000    | +4,741,000  | -----       |
| Grand total, all titles-----            | 4,405,503,700 | 4,372,449,000 | 4,325,969,200 | -79,534,500 | -46,479,800 |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects increase in H. Doc. No. 309.  
<sup>2</sup> Reflects reductions in H. Doc. No. 240 and H. Doc. No. 309.  
<sup>3</sup> Funds for this activity were included with "Operation and maintenance, general" appropriation in fiscal year 1964.

<sup>4</sup> Reflects decrease in H. Doc. No. 309.  
<sup>5</sup> Reflects reduction in H. Doc. No. 240.

○



Union Calendar No. 634

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

[Report No. 1479]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 11, 1964

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money



1 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal  
2 year ending June 30, 1965, for certain civil functions admin-  
3 istered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal,  
4 certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the  
5 Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway  
6 Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority,  
7 and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for other  
8 purposes, namely:

9 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

10 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

11 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by  
14 law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of  
15 national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers  
16 for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor  
17 vehicles; maintenance of that portion of Congressional  
18 Cemetery to which the United States has title, Con-  
19 federate burial places under the jurisdiction of the De-  
20 partment of the Army, and graves used by the  
21 Army in commercial cemeteries; \$13,295,000: *Pro-*  
22 *vided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair  
23 more than a single approach road to any national cemetery:  
24 *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obli-  
25 gated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family  
26 quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such

1 limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as  
2 may be required to provide office space, public comfort  
3 rooms, or space for the storage of Government property  
4 within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimburse-  
5 ment shall be made to the applicable military appropriation  
6 for the pay and allowances of any military personnel per-  
7 forming services primarily for the purposes of this appro-  
8 priation.

#### 9 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

10 The following appropriations shall be expended under  
11 the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the super-  
12 vision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions  
13 of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and har-  
14 bors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

#### 15 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

16 For expenses necessary for the collection and study of  
17 basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood con-  
18 trol, shore protection, and related projects, and when author-  
19 ized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authoriza-  
20 tion for construction, \$20,590,000, to remain available until  
21 expended: *Provided*, That \$210,000 of this appropriation  
22 shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife  
23 Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as  
24 required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958  
25 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation

1 shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with  
2 other features of water-resource development programs of  
3 the Department of the Army.

4 CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

5 For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control,  
6 shore protection, and related projects authorized by law;  
7 and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects  
8 (including those for development with participation or under  
9 consideration for participation by States, local governments,  
10 or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection  
11 by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment  
12 of the Government to construction) ; \$905,767,200, to re-  
13 main available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of  
14 this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by  
15 law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to  
16 be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits  
17 of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appro-  
18 priated: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 of this appropria-  
19 tion shall be transferred to the United States Fish and  
20 Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports  
21 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
22 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife  
23 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
24 nated with other features of water-resource development  
25 programs of the Department of the Army.



## 1            OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

2            For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation,  
3 maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood con-  
4 trol, and related works, including such sums as may be neces-  
5 sary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a  
6 State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor  
7 lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and  
8 navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of  
9 operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the  
10 Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commis-  
11 sion; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navi-  
12 gable waters; surveys and charting of northern and north-  
13 western lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straighten-  
14 ing channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation;  
15 \$158,676,000, to remain available until expended.

16 FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION  
17            EMERGENCIES

18            For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hur-  
19 ricane and shore protection activities, as authorized by section  
20 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 8, 1941, as  
21 amended, \$4,150,000, to remain available until expended:  
22 *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore  
23 appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with  
24 this appropriation.

## GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal Engineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; \$15,575,000.

## FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$73,550,000, to remain available until expended.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Con-



gress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and sixty-seven for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

## THE PANAMA CANAL

### CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; maintaining and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and payments of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, \$29,088,000.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles of which nine are for replacement only, and of which twelve are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; \$4,821,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters of non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding \$16,500.

## PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

## CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended

(31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.

#### LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$10,639,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which eighteen are for replacement only, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding \$30,000: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100 per diem.



## 1 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## 2 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

3 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-  
4 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of  
5 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof  
6 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that  
7 Bureau, as follows:

## 8 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

9 For engineering and economic investigations of proposed  
10 Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conserva-  
11 tion and development plans and activities preliminary to the  
12 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-  
13 justment, or extension of existing projects, including not to  
14 exceed \$400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to  
15 remain available until expended, \$10,354,000, of which  
16 \$9,054,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and  
17 \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River develop-  
18 ment fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall  
19 be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation  
20 requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Pro-*  
21 *vided further*, That \$370,000 of this appropriation shall be  
22 transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service  
23 for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required  
24 by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat.  
25 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive

1 equal consideration and be coordinated with other features  
2 of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of  
3 Reclamation.

4 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

5 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-  
6 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmis-  
7 sion facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized  
8 by law, to remain available until expended, \$182,433,000,  
9 of which \$80,000,000 shall be derived from the reclama-  
10 tion fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall  
11 be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities  
12 within those areas covered by power wheeling service con-  
13 tracts which include provision for service to Federal estab-  
14 lishments and preferred customers, except those transmission  
15 facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore  
16 appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry  
17 out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which  
18 the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is  
19 unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal  
20 projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred  
21 customer: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be made  
22 available under this appropriation for the construction in  
23 Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of the inter-  
24 ceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit which  
25 terminates at any point east of Port Chicago.



## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$40,219,000, of which \$30,758,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,605,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

## LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, \$12,307,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under

1 the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended,  
2 not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the  
3 making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the con-  
4 tract is entered into shall be made only on the same con-  
5 ditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August  
6 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

#### 7 UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

8 For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as au-  
9 thorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to  
10 remain available until expended, \$62,300,000, of which  
11 \$57,800,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado  
12 River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of  
13 April 11, 1956, and \$4,500,000 shall be available for con-  
14 struction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities author-  
15 ized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of  
16 the Department through or in cooperation with State or other  
17 Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are  
18 hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein  
19 appropriated shall be available for construction or operation  
20 of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering  
21 any National Monument.

#### 22 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses of general administration and  
24 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Recla-  
25 mation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclama-

1 tion, \$10,400,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund  
2 and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19,  
3 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of any other  
4 appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or  
5 functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general  
6 administrative expenses.

#### 7 SPECIAL FUNDS

8 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the rec-  
9 lamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colo-  
10 rado River development fund, are appropriated from the  
11 special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17,  
12 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43  
13 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C.  
14 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon  
15 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended  
16 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-  
17 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads  
18 "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administra-  
19 tive Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special  
20 fund from which derived.

#### 21 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

22 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be  
23 available for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger  
24 motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
25 for replacement only; payment of claims for damage to or



1 loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activi-  
2 ties of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as other-  
3 wise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons  
4 on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-  
5 ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation  
6 and administration of interstate compacts without reimburse-  
7 ment or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for in-  
8 formation or evidence concerning violations of law involving  
9 property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation;  
10 performance of the functions specified under the head "Opera-  
11 tion and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclama-  
12 tion, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945;  
13 preparation and dissemination of useful information including  
14 recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies  
15 of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and  
16 recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such  
17 areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August  
18 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) : *Provided*, That no part  
19 of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant  
20 to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses  
21 other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation  
22 projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and  
23 amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and gen-  
24 eral engineering and research under the head "General In-  
25 vestigations".

1       Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the  
2 appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilita-  
3 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those  
4 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under  
5 the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization  
6 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head  
7 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations  
8 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the de-  
9 velopment of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may  
10 be expended through or in cooperation with State and other  
11 Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby  
12 authorized.

13       Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the  
14 performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Rec-  
15 lamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner  
16 provided by law.

17       No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-  
18 mation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which  
19 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but  
20 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,  
21 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,  
22 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this para-  
23 graph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the  
24 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).



1       No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation  
2 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from  
3 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular  
4 benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation  
5 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,  
6 or (c) of any individual when such district, organization,  
7 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in  
8 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into  
9 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the  
10 Bureau of Reclamation.

11       Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the  
12 appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work  
13 by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit  
14 and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or  
15 no acceptable bid has been received and, other than other-  
16 wise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to  
17 meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the  
18 construction allotment for any project from the appropria-  
19 tion "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act  
20 shall be available for construction work by force account:  
21 *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work per-  
22 formed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of  
23 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

## 1                   BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 2                                   CONSTRUCTION

3           For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
4 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,  
5 \$41,220,000, to remain available until expended.

## 6                                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

7           For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
8 the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric  
9 power and energy, \$14,980,000.

## 10                               ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11           Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration  
12 shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon  
13 the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made  
14 herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be avail-  
15 able in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made  
16 for operation and maintenance shall be available only for  
17 the service of the current fiscal year.

18           Other than as may be necessary to meet local emer-  
19 gencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation  
20 for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Ad-  
21 ministration shall be available for construction work by force  
22 account or on a hired-labor basis.

## 1           SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 2                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

3           For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
4 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
5 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
6 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
7 the southeastern power area, including purchase of one  
8 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,000,000.

## 9           SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 10                   CONSTRUCTION

11          For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
12 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative  
13 expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions  
14 of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C.  
15 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$2,-  
16 610,000, to remain available until expended.

## 17                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

18          For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
19 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
20 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
21 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
22 the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to

1 exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only,  
2 \$1,680,000.

3 CONTINUING FUND

4 Not to exceed \$4,500,000 shall be available during the  
5 current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in  
6 connection with the purchase of electric power and energy,  
7 and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available  
10 for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office),  
11 with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency recon-  
12 struction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utili-  
13 ties, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by  
14 fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*,  
15 That no funds shall be made available under this authority  
16 until funds specifically made available to the Department of  
17 the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

18 SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
19 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
20 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
21 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
22 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-  
23 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the  
24 Interior.

25 SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available



1 for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facili-  
2 ties, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to  
3 efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be re-  
4 imbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the  
5 same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932  
6 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs  
7 of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services ren-  
8 dered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
9 time such reimbursements are received.

10 SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this  
11 Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made  
12 available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any pur-  
13 poses other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the  
14 Southwestern Power Administration.

### 15 TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

#### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in  
18 carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
19 as amended, including the employment of aliens; services  
20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
21 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft;  
22 publication and dissemination of atomic information; pur-  
23 chase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment  
24 expenses (not to exceed \$30,000) ; reimbursement of the  
25 General Services Administration for security guard services;

1 hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$2,261,073,000, and any  
2 moneys (except sums received from disposal of property  
3 under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42  
4 U.S.C. 2301) ) received by the Commission, notwithstand-  
5 ing the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes  
6 (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Pro-*  
7 *vided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for  
8 objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the  
9 certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expendi-  
10 ture and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature  
11 thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum  
12 therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*,  
13 That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made  
14 to other agencies of the Government for the performance of  
15 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such  
16 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the  
17 appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That  
18 no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with  
19 the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of con-  
20 tractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or con-  
21 tracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee  
22 for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000  
23 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system  
24 where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

## PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and eighty-four for replacement only (including three at not to exceed \$3,000 each), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of one aircraft; \$363,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrangement for construction of all or a part of such plant by private industry.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the procurement of materials, services.



1 or other costs which are a part of work or activities for  
2 which funds have been provided in any other appropriation  
3 available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate  
4 transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall  
5 subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual  
6 application determined in accordance with generally accepted  
7 accounting principles.

8 Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made avail-  
9 able for the fiscal year 1965 for "Operating expenses"  
10 and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred  
11 between such appropriations, but neither such appropria-  
12 tion, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased  
13 by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and  
14 any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Ap-  
15 propriations Committees of the House and Senate.

16 No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to  
17 confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is  
18 a member of an organization or party that advocates the  
19 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
20 or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds,  
21 upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commis-  
22 sion on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that  
23 reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal  
24 to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any  
25 person who advocates or who is a member of an organiza-



tion or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

#### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as herein after provided.

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT

##### LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an

1 accrual basis, including not to exceed \$6,000 for official  
2 entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval  
3 or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances  
4 therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as author-  
5 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by  
6 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at  
7 rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day: *Provided,*  
8 That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for services of  
9 individuals employed at rates in excess of \$50 per day.

10                   TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

11       PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

12       For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the  
13 Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16  
14 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and  
15 operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed two  
16 hundred and eight for replacement only) and hire of pas-  
17 senger motor vehicles, \$47,915,000, to remain available  
18 until expended.

19                   DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

20                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21       For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
22 United States member of the Delaware River Basin Com-  
23 mission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$39,000.

## 1 CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

2 For payment of the United States share of the current  
3 expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as au-  
4 thorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$92,000.

## 5 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## 6 PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

7 For an additional amount for expenses necessary to  
8 enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes  
9 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541), in-  
10 cluding services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals  
12 not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$4,000,000.

## 13 TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## 14 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

15 SEC. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the  
16 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year  
17 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
18 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor  
19 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed  
20 at \$1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum  
21 shall be \$1,950.

22 SEC. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in



1 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation  
2 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United  
3 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of  
4 which is owned by the Government of the United States)  
5 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such  
6 person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person  
7 in the service of the United States on the date of enactment  
8 of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a  
9 declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United  
10 States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes alle-  
11 giance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland  
12 or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States  
13 for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose  
14 of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall  
15 be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of  
16 this section with respect to his status have been complied  
17 with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false  
18 affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction,  
19 shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not  
20 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
21 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in sub-  
22 stitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided*  
23 *further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee  
24 contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable  
25 in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not



1 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to  
2 nationals of those countries allied with the United States in  
3 the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of  
4 translators, or to temporary employment in the field service  
5 (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

6 SEC. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments  
7 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,  
8 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the  
9 activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters  
10 allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with  
11 title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

12 SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current  
13 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid  
14 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or  
15 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to  
16 approve the nomination of said person.

17 SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in  
18 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used  
19 to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future  
20 volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such  
21 volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the under-  
22 standing that latest published cumulative annual pocket  
23 parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished  
24 free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the  
25 current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest,

---

# A BILL

---

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. KIRWAN

---

JUNE 11, 1964

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 16, 1964  
For actions of June 15, 1964  
88-2nd, No. 120

## CONTENTS

|                            |                            |                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Adjournment.....32         | Farm machinery.....43      | Pay.....39                 |
| Animal research.....27     | Flood relief.....23        | Personnel.....7,25,39      |
| Antidumping.....42         | Food commission.....2,30   | Poverty.....20,33          |
| Appropriations.....19      | Food-for-peace.....28      | Public works.....19        |
| Automation commission...40 | Food stamps.....12         | River basins.....46        |
| Banking and currency.....9 | Foreign aid.....14,39      | Rural areas.....20         |
| Beef.....3,31,36           | Foreign trade.....10,16,38 | Soil conservation....24,34 |
| CCC report.....4           | Forest tracts.....21       | Stockpile.....48           |
| Civil defense.....18       | Forestry.....6,21          | Surplus commodities....16  |
| Claims.....49              | Housing loans.....1,20     | Taxation.....17            |
| Corn.....3                 | Imports.....15,43          | Transportation.....11      |
| Cotton.....12,41           | Indian lands.....44        | Water research.....5,29    |
| Credit unions.....22       | Job Corps.....20           | Watersheds.....35          |
| Defense production.....8   | Land.....26,44             | Wheat.....12,37            |
| Education.....20           | Loans.....1,20,21          | Wildlife.....47            |
| Estes case.....25          | Marketing.....2,30         | Wool labeling.....15       |
| Farm labor.....13,20       | Mining.....26              | World Farm Center.....45   |

HIGHLIGHTS: For highlights see page 6.

## HOUSE

1. HOUSING LOANS. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H. J. Res. 1041, to continue from June 30 to Sept. 30, 1964, the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas. pp. 13259-60
2. MARKETING COMMISSION. Agreed to a Senate request for the return of S. J. Res. 71, to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing. p. 13252
3. BEEF. Rep. Jensen spoke in favor of the use of corn-fed beef. p. 13252
4. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Received from the President the annual report of CCC for the fiscal year 1963. p. 13252
5. WATER RESEARCH. House conferees were appointed on S. 2, to establish Federal-aid water-research (p. 13253). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

6. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 7588, to provide for enforcement of rules and regulations for the protection, development, and administration of the national forests and national grasslands. p. 13253
7. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported S. 1833, to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian Government officers and employees. pp. 13254-5  
Passed, under suspension of the rules, S. J. Res. 103, to increase the authorization for the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. pp. 13257-9
8. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 10000, to extend the Defense Production Act from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1966. pp. 13260-1
9. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 11499, to extend for 2 years the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase U. S. obligations directly from the Treasury. pp. 13261-2
10. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Michel inserted a colloquy on "Free Enterprise in the Free World: A Business-Government Joint Venture." pp. 13262-6
11. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Younger deplored the refusal of the Rules Committee to clear H. R. 9903, the omnibus transportation bill, and inserted an article by Morris Forgash, "Transportation Equation: Apathy Plus Inaction Divided By Talk Equals Crisis and Nationalization." pp. 13280-4
12. WHEAT; COTTON; FOOD STAMPS. Rep. Cleveland claimed, and inserted an article by Rep. Curtis claiming, that there was a log-rolling deal in connection with the wheat-cotton bill and the food-stamp bill. pp. 13284-6
13. FARM LABOR. Rep. Teague, Calif., inserted an editorial favoring the Mexican farm labor program. p. 13286
14. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Halpern commended the foreign-aid bill as recently passed by the House. pp. 13286-7
15. WOOL LABELING. Rep. Gross expressed a hope that it is not true that the State Department requested postponement of H. R. 4994, to provide for the labeling of imported woven labels. p. 13287
16. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received from FAS the report for May pursuant to Public Law 480. p. 13288
17. TAXATION. The Judiciary Committee submitted a report on State taxation of interstate commerce (H. Rept. 1480). p. 13288
18. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 10314, to amend and extend the Civil Defense Act of 1950 (H. Rept. 1484). p. 13288
19. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of this bill, H. R. 11579, which is to be considered today, June 16. pp. 13288, D469

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11579

---

JUNE 15, 1964.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 785]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 785, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○





# H. RES. 785

[Report No. 1486]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 15, 1964

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

## RESOLUTION

1       *Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R.  
2   11579), making appropriations for certain civil functions  
3   administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama  
4   Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior,  
5   the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Sea-  
6   way Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Au-  
7   thority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the  
8   fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes,  
9   all points of order against title III of said bill are hereby  
10   waived.

88TH CONGRESS  
2d Session

H. RES. 785

[Report No. 1486]

RESOLUTION

Providing for consideration of H.R. 11579, a bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Sisk

JUNE 15, 1964

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued June 17, 1964  
For actions of June 16, 1964  
88-2nd, No. 121

### CONTENTS

|                            |                            |                           |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Agricultural products...13 | Electrification....5,10,24 | Mining.....36             |
| Alaska relief.....2        | Expenditures.....30        | National seashore.....41  |
| Antidumping.....37         | Farm implements.....38     | News service.....33       |
| Appalachia.....11          | Farm program.....23,28     | Particleboard.....3       |
| Appropriations.....7       | Finance.....19             | Pay.....16,21             |
| Area redevelopment...14,31 | Foreign aid.....15,20      | Perishable food.....26    |
| Automation.....35          | Foreign trade.....13,29    | Personnel.....16,21,30,45 |
| Beef imports.....8,27      | Household effects.....3    | Poverty.....44            |
| Civil rights.....1         | Housing loans.....22       | Procurement.....42        |
| Coffee.....3               | Legislative program.....6  | Public works.....7        |
| Committee assignments...12 | Market news.....33         | Reclamation.....17        |
| Commodity exchanges....34  | Metal scrap.....3          | Rental quarters.....45    |
| Conservation.....4         | Military milk.....43       | Soil conservation.....32  |
|                            |                            | Strawberries.....39       |
|                            |                            | Sugarbeets.....18         |
|                            |                            | Tariff.....3,38,39        |
|                            |                            | Tobacco.....3             |
|                            |                            | Water resources.....40    |
|                            |                            | Watersheds.....9          |
|                            |                            | Wheat.....28              |
|                            |                            | Wheat museum.....25       |
|                            |                            | Wilderness.....46         |
|                            |                            | Wool.....3                |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted to report Alaska earthquake relief bill. House passed public works appropriation bill. Rep. Short criticized USDA position on beef imports. Rep. Nelsen charged REA Administrator engaged in political activity. Rep. Rooney inserted Batt's statement in defense of area redevelopment program. Rep. Moore commended proposed Appalachia program.

### SENATE

1. CIVIL RIGHTS. Continued debate on H. R. 7152, the civil rights bill. pp. 13382-417, 13421-22, 13425-58.
2. ALASKA RELIEF. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 2881, providing for assistance to Alaska for reconstruction of damage from the recent earthquake. p. D473
3. TARIFF. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2652, to provide for duty-free importation of certain wools for use in manufacturing of polishing felts (S. Rept. 1082); H. R. 4198, to provide for free importation of soluble and instant coffee (S. Rept. 1084); H. R. 8268, to prevent double taxation in the case of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to the U. S. for delivery to a manufacturer's bonded factory (S. Rept. 1086); H. R. 8975, to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard (S. Rept. 1087); H. R. 10463, to continue through June 30, 1965, the suspension of duties for metal scrap (S. Rept. 1089); H. R. 10465, to extend for a temporary period

the provisions relating to free importation of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders (S. Rept. 1090). p. 13372

4. CONSERVATION. Sen. Metcalf inserted a speech by Secretary Udall, "Cooperative Conservation for Western Progress." pp. 13418-20
5. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article favoring reappointment of Charles H. Ross to the Federal Power Commission. pp. 13420-1
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader Mansfield announced that it is the intention of the leadership to recess the Senate from Thurs., July 2, until Mon., July 6, and that the Senate will be in inactive status from Fri., July 10, until Mon., July 20, covering the period immediately before and after the Republican National Convention. p. 13389

#### HOUSE

7. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. By a vote of 360 to 11, passed without amendment this bill, H. R. 11579, which includes items for the public works acceleration program, Defense civil functions, Interior power agencies, Atomic Energy Commission, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., Tennessee Valley Authority, and Delaware River Basin Commission (pp. 13466-80) With regard to the public works acceleration item, the Committee report includes the following statement: "Funds allowed under this heading are for the purposes of terminating this program in fiscal year 1965 and include \$1,130,000 for contingencies and \$2,870,000 for administrative expenses. None of the funds budgeted are for the purpose of undertaking additional projects. It is the Committee's opinion that this reduction, which has been made in the contingency item, can be realized in the closing out costs. The full request for administrative expenses has been allowed."

As passed, this bill includes various general provisions, applying to the Government generally, as follows: Limits the amount which may be paid for a passenger vehicle to \$1,500, except for station wagons the maximum of which is \$1,950. Requires Federal employees to be U.S. citizens, with certain exceptions such as aliens from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence. Provides for quarters and cost-of-living allowances in accordance with the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act. Prohibits payments to employees whose nominations the Senate has rejected. Limits the price which may be paid for the U. S. Code to \$4 per volume, and for the Lifetime Federal Digest to \$4.25 per volume, and \$6.50 per volume on the Modern Federal Practice Digest. In the case of certain corporations, makes appropriations available for certain purposes, such as rent in the District of Columbia. Permits foreign credits to be used only when reimbursement is made to the Treasury Department. Provides that during the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts. Prohibits the use of funds by any agency for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

8. BEEF IMPORTS. Rep. Short criticized this Department's position in opposing enactment of legislation to restrict beef imports. p. 13462
9. WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee approved six watershed projects. p. D475



of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$1,187.90" and insert "\$1,089.34."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. MARIE ROSE COLANDRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4967) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Rose Colandro.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 4967, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### MARY HORALEK, BLUE RAPIDS, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5407) for the relief of Mary Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Horalek, of Blue Rapids, Kansas, an amount not to exceed \$6,500, determined by the Secretary of the Army to be the fair market value of the real estate owned by her adjacent to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Marshall County, Kansas, upon conveyance of a good and merchantable title to that land to the United States of America within a period of one year from the date of notification to Mary Horalek of the value determined by the Secretary of the Army. The payment of the sum so determined shall be paid Mary Horalek as the full consideration for conveyance of the land and shall be in full settlement of her claims for damages she suffered due to the construction of the Tuttle Creek flood control reservoir.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim,

and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek and Eva Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kansas."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "Mary Horalek" insert "and Eva Horalek."

On page 1, line 8, strike "her" and insert "them".

On page 2, line 1, after "Mary Horalek" insert "and Eva Horalek".

On page 2, line 3, after "Mary Horalek" insert "and Eva Horalek".

On page 2, line 5, strike "her" and "she" and insert "their" and "they".

On page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek and Eva Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MALONEY BROS. NURSERY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6882) for the relief of the Maloney Bros. Nursery Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of New York the sum of \$1,232.06. Such sum shall be paid to the State of New York only if the Secretary of Labor certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury that such sums will be used by the State of New York as a credit against the liability for tax under the New York State unemployment tax laws of the Maloney Brothers Nursery Company, Incorporated, of Dansville, New York, for the taxable years 1953, 1954, and 1955, and will extinguish all liability of the said Maloney Brothers Nursery Company, Incorporated, under such laws for such taxable years. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike lines 6, 7, and 8 and insert "\$1,232.06 on the conditions that it will be used".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CAPT. LESLIE B. SHANOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8286) for the relief of Capt. Leslie B. Shanoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Captain Leslie B. Shanoff is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,201.67 representing overpayments of flying pay as the result of an error made by the Government during the period January 26, 1962, to June 30, 1963, while he was serving on active duty with the United States Air Force. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leslie B. Shanoff, an amount equal to the aggravated of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WILMER ALLERS AND JANE B. ALLERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9372) to remove a cloud on the title of certain property owned by Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers, both of Malin, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to release to Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (husband and wife), both of Malin, Oregon, and their heirs and assigns, that interest reserved by the United States in lots 4, 5, 6, and 7 of block 29, supplemental plat of Malin (Klamath County), Oregon, pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371), which interest relates to the right of the United States to construct ditches and canals upon and through such lots.

SEC. 2. Upon payment within six months following the date of enactment of this Act by the said Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (or their heirs or assigns) to the Secretary of the Interior of an amount equal to the current fair market value of the interest authorized to be released under the first section as determined by the Secretary after appraisal, the Secretary shall execute and deliver to Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (or their heirs or assigns) an appropriate written instrument which will effect the release so authorized.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:



"That the United States hereby releases and quitclaims to Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (husband and wife), both of Malin, Oregon, and their heirs and assigns, that interest reserved by the United States in lots 4, 5, 6, and 7 of block 29, supplemental plat of Malin (Klamath County), Oregon, pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391), which interest relates to the right of the United States to construct ditches and canals upon and through such lots."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 785, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11579), making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, all points of order against title III of said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution speaks for itself. The Committee on Appropriations finds itself in a situation where it is necessary to go ahead and appropriate for the many programs falling under the public works program. Included in that program are the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. That authorization bill, of course, only recently passed the House and is at present pending before the other body where, because of other business at hand, they have not had an opportunity to act upon it. Therefore, the authorization has not been signed into law. So the purpose of this resolution is simply to waive points of order against title III of the bill. That is all the resolution does. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 785, and I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has explained, this rule simply makes in order the consideration of H.R. 11579, the annual public works appropriation bill after providing for a waiver of points of order on one section of the bill, which is, of course, the section relating to appropriations for the

Atomic Energy Commission. The Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill has passed the House but has not yet passed the Senate. Therefore, it is necessary to waive points of order on that particular section of this bill. The bill itself is, of course, an annual measure, is a very important one from many angles. It carries a total of \$4,325,969,200, which, by the way, is some \$79,534,000 less than was appropriated for the same purposes last year and some \$46,479,800 less than requested in the President's budget.

The largest amount or item in the bill, of course, is the one for the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the total for that agency of the Government alone being \$2,621,073,000. This bill also carries, as the title of the measure shows, appropriations for many other civil functions of the Government, such as the operation of the Panama Canal, certain agencies within the Department of the Interior, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and also carries a number of flood control projects throughout the Nation.

I would like to point out, if I may, that the entire appropriation contained in this bill for various flood control purposes in the Mississippi River and tributary basins, where most flood control projects are located, amounts to only \$73,550,000 in all. But they are all important projects, and a great many congressional districts are affected by this particular section of the bill. I am sure the full measure itself will receive the favorable attention of the House.

There is no limit as to the length of time to be assigned for general debate. That will depend entirely upon the desires of the Subcommittee on Appropriations itself which is headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Points of order are waived on this bill only because the authorization bill has not been cleared by the other body; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And signed by the President.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the section applying to the Atomic Energy Commission that would otherwise be subject to a point of order?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is the understanding that was given very clearly to the Committee on Rules. The testimony before the Committee on Rules was that the only reason for requesting a waiver of points of order was the legislative situation which exists in connection with the authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission and does not in any way affect any other portion of the bill. I suggest to the gentleman that he might address his remarks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I think he will agree that is the understanding that we had before our committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield so I may ask a question of the gentleman from Ohio. What I am trying to ascertain is whether there is anything in the Atomic Energy Commission section of this bill which would be subject to a point of order other than the fact that the authorization bill has not been enacted into law.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, there is one which we indicated in the report.

Mr. GROSS. Then by waiving points of order on this bill we are waiving it for a multiplicity of reasons, not just one reason, is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is no change in the language at all except for provision for one transfer, similar to what we have had in past years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. I would like to take just a moment of the time of the House to direct a clarifying question to the distinguished chairman. This has to do with the language on page 44 of the report.

I am informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has virtually reached an agreement with P.G. & E. for wheeling which, if satisfactory, could eliminate the necessity for a Federal line. I understand that it was for this reason that the language of the report was framed in the manner it has been. However, in order to ascertain the true intent, I would like to ask if I am correct in assuming that it is the committee's intention that, if for any reason such an agreement were not consummated, the amount of \$2,300,000 could be used for construction of a Federal line.

Mr. KIRWAN. Not this year. The committee does not want the money used for any other purpose, including the construction of the Federal line. For example, the language in the report prevents the Bureau from using the money to build the Denver office building.

Mr. SISK. I thank the distinguished chairman very much for that answer because the specification was that this money could not be used, for example, as the gentleman indicated, to build a building in Denver, or for a variety of other purposes, but could only be used for purposes of this wheeling agreement in connection with the construction of a transmission line in this particular area.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman understands this matter thoroughly. The language in the report, of course, is quite clear. The gentleman is correct, as I understand, when he says that the funds allowed are available only to implement the wheeling offer. That is the purpose of the money and for that only.

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding—and this, of course, was the only reason I asked the question—that this money cannot be used for any purpose other



than arrangements for getting power from Tracy into the San Luis pumping plant. Whether any money can be used in implementing the wheeling agreement which I understand is probably firm and whether it is used for construction, it is still limited to this specific project and cannot be transferred to some other project or item.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Perhaps the gentleman from California does not realize this—I think he does—but as I understand it this money cannot be used for any purpose other than implementing the wheeling agreement. It cannot be used for construction.

Mr. SISK. This, of course, is not the understanding I have nor is it the understanding of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The limitation here and the intent of the language is that this money has to be used for a transmission line or for wheeling arrangements dealing with the transmission of power from Tracy to the San Luis pumping plant.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is not as I understand the situation.

Mr. SISK. Otherwise, I might say to the gentleman from Arizona, of course, there would not be any point in the language, because the purpose here was to get the best agreement we could from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for wheeling. I understand they are probably close to an agreement, and I have no disagreement with them, unless, of course, however, there is to be a prohibition here to the effect that no money can be used. In other words, in essence, if Congress is saying they cannot build a transmission line, this would place the Department in an untenable position.

Mr. JENSEN. And if we do not obtain a good contract from the P.G. & E., they will probably start building the line; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is my understanding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is not my impression that the money could be used for construction under any circumstances.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the money could not be used for construction this year.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Not this year.

Mr. KIRWAN. We expect to get a good contract from the P.G. & E. We expect that and that is what we want.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And if that contract is not concluded then the Bureau of Reclamation must come to the Congress next year for any money to be used for construction purposes?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is right; we would consider it again next year. They cannot perform any construction this year.

Mr. SISK. I understand that and that was the point I was attempting to make. The only reason the question was asked was for interpretive purposes.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, the Bureau of Reclamation now has an offer from the local utility, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to supply wheeling service at less than Federal cost. The committee has disallowed the use of funds for construction of facilities covered by this offer. The funds allowed are available only to implement the wheeling offer. That is the situation in a nutshell.

Mr. SISK. I understand exactly what the committee is doing. I simply want to make it clear that the limitation on these funds had to do with their use, but it did not say in essence that you must consummate an agreement for wheeling with Pacific Gas & Electric.

I am inclined to agree that Pacific Gas & Electric can wheel here probably for less money than the Federal Government can afford to build a line and do it. On the other hand, the point I am trying to make clear is that this is not a demand upon the Department that they must consummate this agreement. This is simply a limitation to the effect that this money cannot be used for any other purpose. Of course, as the gentleman indicated, nor for construction this year of this line. If they cannot come up with an agreement that is satisfactory then, of course, we will meet the issue next year if we need to build a Federal line.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the language in the report speaks for itself.

Mr. SISK. I got the interpretation that I was seeking, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the reconsideration of the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11579, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, this bill totals \$4,325,-969,200 which is \$79,534,500 below the 1964 appropriation and \$46,479,800 below the budget estimate.

For the Corps of Engineers the bill includes a total of \$1,178,308,200, an increase of \$28,944,200 over the budget. The committee has added 33 unbudgeted studies, increased the budget on 6 studies, added 11 new planning starts, making a total of 28 new planning items; and added 16 new unbudgeted construction starts, making a total of 54 new starts.

The bill includes a total of \$318,013,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, a decrease of \$36,068,200 from the current year and an increase of \$263,000 over the budget.

The bill includes five new budgeted reclamation construction starts.

The committee has disallowed the \$1 million budgeted for planning a high-voltage line from the Bonneville system into southern Idaho. The committee has directed in the report—page 47—that no funds be expended except for good faith negotiations to be continued or initiated with interested parties to wheel Bonneville power to serve preference customers only in the southern Idaho Federal marketing area. If no satisfactory wheeling arrangements can be reported to the committee by the time of its action on the fiscal year 1966 budget estimates, it will invite a further proposal for Federal construction.

The bill includes a total of \$2,624,073,-000 for the Atomic Energy Commission a decrease of \$118,596,000 from 1964, and a reduction of \$68,927,000 in the budget. The reduction in the budget includes a decrease of \$10,965,000 made by the authorizing committee and \$57,962,000 made by our subcommittee, primarily in physical research, reactor development, and anticipated slippage and increase in carryover unobligated balances.

Mr. Chairman, now I would like to tell you about the importance of this program.

I have been on this committee about 21 years. I think this is one of the best public works bills that ever came to the House. Down through history the Corps of Engineers has spent a total of \$16.5 billion on this country for flood control, navigation, and multiple-purpose projects. Twelve billion, seven hundred million dollars of this, or 77 percent, has been spent just in the last 20 years. Very little was done for America until the past 20 years. Seven billion, six hundred million dollars of the total has been spent just since 1956.

When you realize that we received over 350 requests from Members of Congress to either add to budgeted projects or add unbudgeted projects you can appreciate the job that remains to be done.



They know what is going on in their own districts. They see the need with their own eyes. Down through the years very little action has been taken in comparison to the projects that must be constructed.

The gross national product of this Nation in 1929 was \$104 billion. In 1932 it was \$58 billion. In 1933 it was only \$56 billion. Last year it was \$600 billion. Just stop and think of that, over 10 times greater than it was in 1933. Thus you know this committee and this Congress itself are not wasting money. We are building America, as we must, if we want to stay on top and lead the rest of the nations.

The Ohio River project was constructed by the Army Engineers beginning in 1929. When they first started to dredge that river in the early twenties some thought it would haul 20 million tons of freight. In 1942 they hauled 32 million. In 1962 they hauled 85 million tons on the Ohio River, and it is now up around 90 million. The Ohio River is next in the world to the Rhine in tonnage of freight hauled.

The population of America at the turn of the century was 76 million. In 1952 we had 145 million. In 1964 we have 192 million. In 1975 we will have about 225 million people. The question is, Where are you going to get the water?

At the rate we are going, in 1975, 10½ years from now, we are going to wake up some morning and there will be no water. Look at what happened this year in droughts all over the Nation, and last year. Just stop and think. People on many occasions were not allowed to use water for certain purposes all over this country. But take 225 million people 9½ years from now in this country. Every time they build a house, a garage, a drive, and a street out in front of it, we cannot get that water into a storm sewer fast enough to get it in the river and on its way to the sea. We have made little effort since the beginning of time to preserve that water. All we have done is see how fast we can destroy ourselves by getting it into a storm sewer. At the rate we are going there will be only one answer, we will wake up some morning to our own destruction, unless we do a better job at passing bills and putting more money into building America. We are building the rest of the world, but any time you try to do something in and for this country you have the toughest job anybody has had. Everybody is in the way at every turn of the road.

The number of people employed in the United States in 1942 was 53.7 million. When a former Vice President said that some day we were going to employ 60 million people in this country, you might say that they ran him out of public office. Remember the cry that went up that day when he made that prediction?

I called this morning and asked how many people were employed in America. Today over 70 million people are employed in America. You see how far even that man missed the boat. But what did they call that gentleman all over this country? He was denounced as being radical.

Now let us look at the recreation business. Under the Corps of Army Engineers, in 1950, only 16 million people visited the reservoirs. That is how few we had at that time. But with the investment in recent years in these projects, in 1962 127 million people visited the reservoirs and recreation areas.

In 1950, the Forest Service had only 27 million visitors, but in 1962 they had 113 million.

In 1950, the Park Service had 33 million visitors, and in 1962 they had 88 million visitors.

In 1950, all they had was a total of 76 million people to visit these recreation areas in our parks, forests, and the corps projects. Three hundred and twenty-eight million people visited them in 1962. The total visits are up over 400 percent since 1950 and 800 percent on the corps projects. Just stop to think of that. People are now spending far more each year on recreation alone than we appropriate in this bill. I have been chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and I remember in 1950 a gentleman came down the aisle and offered an amendment to cut the Park Service by \$100,000. Suppose we had let it stay that way. Do you think we would have had 88 million people going to visit the national parks unless the funds were provided?

You hear a lot of people talk about what creates prosperity—whether it is the automobile industry, the railroad industry, the utilities, and so on. There is only one place that prosperity comes from and that is from the wood and the land and the water. That is where prosperity comes from. It starts with our natural resources, not from Ford, not from General Motors, where the product is finished. The investment we have made in protecting our resources has come back many times and we should increase our expenditures if we are going to maintain and increase our prosperity. So that is the point I am trying to stress and to bring home to you. That our prosperity starts down on that land and wood and water—in agriculture, in the forests, and in the minerals of our land. Every bit of it is down there and that is what this bill means.

So what I am asking you here today is to approve this bill and I can tell you, after being on this committee a long time, that this is one of the best bills that has ever come to the Congress. Every year that I come down to the well of this House to speak for this bill, the only difference is that there should be another billion dollars in the bill for water because 9 years from now you will not be able to put in \$6 or \$8 billion into one bill and expect that you are going to be able to build the dams and reservoirs overnight. These projects take 3 and 4 and 5 and 6 years to build. That is why I am telling you that when we provide for only 54 new construction starts in this bill, only 2 more than in the House bill last year, we are only doing a minimum job. The country has grown bigger than that. So every one of you in this Chamber today should take an inventory of his district when he goes home this fall, if he wants to do some-

thing for America, and see what is needed in the way of water and in the way of taking care of our home, the greatest country in the world, America.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In the light of what the gentleman is saying about trying to do something for the country, and so on, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if the Appropriations Committee has given attention to a matter which I wish to point out.

One of our reclamation projects, in one bid for some roller mounted gates and outlet works, results in the following bid situation: A Japanese firm offered to do the job for \$300,000 and a Bavarian company for \$341,000, while the smallest amount bid by an American is one-third higher, \$436,000. Two American firms bid up to \$737,000 on this job.

One of these American companies demonstrated to me, through its figures, that it anticipated, by doing everything in the most efficient manner possible, it could come out with a 7-percent profit on its bid, which is more than 33½ percent higher than the Japanese bid on the same project.

As I stated before, I wish to find out from the distinguished gentleman if the Appropriations Committee has gone into the matter of foreign and domestic bidding on such projects as are found in the reclamation field.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not say that the Appropriations Committee has gone into this to any extent for we consider it a legislative matter. I will say that so long as we are selling \$22 billion in exports to the other countries of the world and they are only selling \$17 billion worth to us, I am for recognizing some of those countries and letting them do some work here.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am happy to tell the House that this is a good bill. I hope, as time marches on, that we who serve in the Congress of the United States will realize the truth of what I am stating here today.

When the rain falls today, we should make proper provisions to assure that it is conserved, not wasted and allowed to cause such great flood damages.

What I said a year ago I say again today. For one of the first times in the United States—over in nearby Virginia—they are building a settlement which will house 75,000 people, and the first thing they have done is to build a reservoir to save and protect the water.

We must not permit the water to get away. We must keep it where God let it fall. We must do that when we are building new towns or new communities. We must support appropriations for water resource development if we are to meet our present and future needs.

I ask Members to stop awhile, to think of the \$600 billion gross national product for last year, compared to one of \$56 billion in 1933. What a vast difference there is. Today 70 million people are working. There were 35 million people working at that time. Yet there is com-



plaint about spending a dollar on America.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I must take slight issue with the gentleman—and perhaps more than slight issue with the gentleman from Ohio—with respect to the trade issue and the favorable balance of trade of the United States, which he claims exists.

I believe if the gentleman would shake the Public Law 480 sales—and when I say “sales” I put quotation marks before and after the word—shake out of the Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies and grants-in-aid to foreign countries, he would find a different situation.

I doubt very much that he will find we are ahead in the trade picture today if he shakes that out of the trade figures.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about exports and imports that are paid for. My figures exclude military grant aid.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about imports and exports.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But the trouble with these figures is that they load the so-called Public Law 480 sales figures into the export figures. We do not sell for cash or true barter any substantial amount of Public Law 480 products.

Mr. KIRWAN. I called on the Department of Commerce with reference to what the gentleman is talking about and was assured the figures excluded military grant aid.

Back in 1954 there was only \$2 billion in difference between the imports and exports. Much of this was due to the imports of minerals for stockpiling that we did not need and the gentleman knows the part I played in stopping this needless stockpiling.

The gentleman is one of the best Members in the Congress and I appreciate his comments on this problem.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio. He made a very eloquent plea, as he always does, for the full development of our water resources. He is one of the great conservationists of our time. He knows that the district I represent has some 7 to 13 inches of annual rainfall and we know the problem of conserving water there. We are developing the water resources we have. I want to say every time I appear before the gentleman's committee we get the most sympathetic attention to our problem. I also want to say that of all the projects that have been developed there has not been a dollar wasted and this is the best investment in the future of America that we can make now. I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio bears a great share of the credit for the work going on. I think we should all pay heed to his warning that it is not going to be too long from now when water is going to be so critical that it will not just

be areas such as mine which are short of rainfall, but it will be all of the areas of the country where we are going to feel the pinch with regard to shortages of water.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Again I repeat I do not expect to be around in 1975. My Maker has been very, very kind to me now. But again I repeat it is time to take warning. It is estimated that we will have about 225 million people here in this country in just about 10 years from now, in 1975. You know what the stress is today on water. What do you think it will be on some sunny morning in 1975 when there are 225 million people in this country? So we had better stop, look, and listen and do a better job than has been done down through the years. In conclusion, I want to say that it has been a real pleasure to work with all the members of the subcommittee and the staff in preparing this bill for the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and I have worked on the same committees for the past 21 years. We sometimes disagree, but we always disagree agreeably and we work out our differences in committee, if differences arise in language or in figures. When we bring a bill to the floor, the record will show that those bills have been amended very, very little.

I want to pay my compliment to every member of this Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. They worked long and faithfully. We had long hearings. They are dedicated Members of this House. We also have a staff in Carson Culp and Eugene Wilhelm of which we are very proud. They have been with us many, many years and give us good service.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has explained this bill so far as dollars are concerned. The report shows that this bill calls for \$46,479,800 less than the budget requested. Also it is \$79,534,500 below the 1964 fiscal year budget. I can assure every Member of this House and every American living in the U.S.A. today that it is no small chore for the committee to hold this bill down to these figures. Over 1,000 people presented themselves before our subcommittee this year from almost every State in the Union and from almost every district. Requests were made to increase the budget by over 300 of those witnesses, through their spokesman.

So that to hold this bill to the figures we have submitted, as I have just given them, again I say is no small task.

We all realize the importance of keeping the raindrops that fall from the heavens as near to the spot as possible where they fall. Water is becoming liquid gold, so to speak, in almost every area of these United States. On the other hand, floods destroy not only property by the hundreds of millions of dollars every year but also take many lives. So we have a sort of a two-pronged responsibility; first, to conserve our precious liquid gold, and next to control flood water which we

know, unless controlled, will continue to destroy property and life.

Hence we build dams on the main stems of our rivers and on the tributaries to control the floods and to flood water also that it might filter back into the land adjacent to the dams and thus bring the water level up closer to the roots of crops.

Mr. Chairman, it was not too many years ago when the underground fresh water had gone down 11 feet on an average in the entire United States. We are gradually raising the water level by building these impoundments on the main stems and on the tributaries. The Soil Conservation Service program has done and is doing much to assist in conserving our land and water resources.

Mr. Chairman, I was quite disturbed, as, I think, were all of the members of the committee, when the atomic energy officials talked about money in this bill for the purpose of exploring from the Moon other planets after we land a man or men on the Moon. Well, the question is: Are we going to be able to land a man or men on the Moon? But already they have a very ambitious program all dreamed up, after we do land a man on the Moon, then we must from there explore Jupiter and Mars and all the rest of the planets. That, of course, will cost billions of dollars over the period from now on until Gabriel blows his horn.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee. Hence the responsibility falls on the legislative committees of Congress to determine just what we are going to do in that big, broad, heavenly field. So there was not much we could do except to indicate to the Atomic Energy Commission, and they in turn to the Space Administration, they best go slow on this one.

All of us who are trying to conserve our taxpayers' money by not wasting their hard-earned dollars are well aware that every American today is working about 4 months of the year for Uncle Sam, meaning local, State, and Federal.

Not too many Americans are aware of the fact that all the farms in America are estimated at actual value only \$143 billion. One of these days a bill will come before this House to raise the national debt ceiling up to \$325 billion. Now, when we talk about the national product we had best at the same time think seriously about how much each American family is assessed each year for local, State, and national taxes. The facts and figures are plain.

For instance, the House a few days ago passed a bill which raised the salaries of all Federal employees, Congressmen, judges, and all Federal servants. Every American family, on an average, will pay, if this salary raise is made law, \$30 each month just to be governed from Washington, D.C. Yes, quite startling.

Also may I remind my colleagues that it costs each American family, on an average, about \$17 a month just to pay the interest on the national debt.

At the same time it is necessary, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] stated, to conserve our great resources,



land, woods, and water. All new wealth springs from Mother Earth, all raw products either grows out of the ground, is pumped or mined out of the bowels of the earth, or is fished out of the water. Everybody employed in the United States either produce, transfer, process, market, or use the finished product made from those raw products.

Mr. Chairman, I have never apologized for supporting this bill, which appropriates the dollars of the American people for America and for no one else but Americans.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, public works is a justifiably honored title in our country.

Public works have provided the sinews of much of our national strength throughout our history.

Public works have made America great and strong.

In discussing some of the details of this bill—the public works appropriations bill of 1964—it is appropriate that we reflect on some of the great achievements our country has made in the past.

The Panama Canal, Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, the St. Lawrence Seaway—all of these great projects stand as enduring landmarks in our country's steady growth toward broader frontiers of opportunity. They are symbols of our country's vast creative capacity.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, in my own State, has won world recognition and acclaim as a comprehensive development in a seven-State area of the South.

We have built massive dams in the Northwest and other regions of our great country to harness power and control floods.

We have turned wastelands into fruitful gardens through irrigation projects.

We have built levees along the mighty Mississippi, cleared river channels, dredged harbors. We have developed America.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, how better could these Federal funds have been spent?

Our mighty Nation can well afford to invest in the conservation and development of its precious natural resources. It can never afford to neglect public works.

This bill, Mr. Chairman—the public works appropriation bill for 1965—is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills coming before the Congress. The bill will provide for the continued development of our Nation's resources—for the overall growth and strengthening of our country—the United States of America.

Appropriations included in this bill will provide funds for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers, for the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, the several public power agencies, including the Bonneville, Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Panama Canal, the Delaware River Basin Commission, along with an appropriation for

the public works acceleration program, among others.

As has been said, this is an "all American bill." It is a bill to strengthen our own country.

This bill has been carefully screened. Every provision has been considered in minute detail. Every project involved has been examined thoroughly with regard to its usefulness and with relation to our overall fiscal obligations.

Testimony and other relevant data received and considered by our committee fill nearly 4,000 pages in 4 printed volumes of the hearings that extended over more than 5 months. In addition to weighing the testimony from the various agency heads and their assistants, from State and local public officials, from Members of Congress, and from interested citizens in connection with the projects included in this bill, our committee has done a monumental job of analyzing the requests for funds.

This is the last public works appropriations bill bearing the stamp of our late great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gallant gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable Clarence Cannon. He was both the Chairman of the Whole Committee and chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations. Over the years, his great experience and broad knowledge in the public works field have been invaluable to the committee in analyzing and preparing the annual public works appropriations bills. He had worked zealously to advance and perfect the present bill before his death on May 12.

Clarence Cannon's great work and his leadership were never more evident than in the appropriations procedures of this session. He established the stepped-up timetable which the Committee on Appropriations and the House have maintained this year. Despite his 85 years, he continued his customary heavy working schedule to the last.

He was a distinguished legislator, a world renowned parliamentarian, and our generation's great conservator of the public funds. He was a powerful champion of development programs for his beloved Missouri River and other great rivers of the Nation. He was a true friend of TVA and other programs enacted by the Congress to conserve and develop our natural resources.

His influence continues and will long continue to serve our country well. In his distinguished successor, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, the Committee on Appropriations has a chairman who serves in the same great tradition.

I know that I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the gentleman from Missouri, and in expressing pride and appreciation at the privilege of having served with him on this committee.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this committee also with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who has so ably presented this bill; the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Throughout the hearings we have had the expert assistance of the two very able and knowledgeable members of our subcommittee staff, Carlson Culp and Gene Wilhelm. They deserve to be commended publicly for the valuable work they have performed in handling many of the details and much of the work on this bill.

As has been said, Mr. Chairman, this bill carries total appropriations of \$4,325,696,200—a reduction of \$46,467,900 in the budget estimates, and a decrease of \$79,534,500 below appropriations for fiscal year 1964.

Funds are provided in this bill for 51 new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and 6 for the Bureau of Reclamation—a total of 57 new construction starts, excluding reimbursements and resummptions. These projects include 18 new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers that were provided for in budget estimates, plus 18 added by the committee.

In addition, appropriations for 32 unbudgeted surveys and for the initiation of planning on 13 unbudgeted projects are included in this bill.

A breakdown of the estimates and the appropriations recommended for the various public-works programs follows:

| Activity                                          | Budget estimate, 1965 | Recommended by the committee | Change from budget estimate |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cemeterial expenses.....                          | \$13, 295, 000        | \$13, 295, 000               |                             |
| Rivers and harbors and flood control.....         | 1, 149, 364, 000      | 1, 178, 308, 200             | +\$28, 944, 200             |
| The Panama Canal.....                             | 33, 909, 000          | 33, 909, 000                 |                             |
| Bureau of Reclamation.....                        | 317, 750, 000         | 381, 013, 000                | +263, 000                   |
| Power agencies of the Department of Interior..... | 64, 250, 000          | 61, 490, 000                 | -2, 760, 000                |
| Atomic Energy Commission.....                     | 2, 693, 000, 000      | 2, 624, 073, 000             | -68, 927, 000               |
| Tennessee Valley Authority.....                   | 50, 915, 000          | 47, 915, 000                 | -3, 000, 000                |
| Delaware River Basin Commission.....              | 131, 000              | 131, 000                     |                             |
| Public Works acceleration.....                    | 5, 000, 000           | 4, 000, 000                  | -1, 000, 000                |
| Indefinite appropriations.....                    | 44, 835, 000          | 44, 835, 000                 |                             |
| Total.....                                        | 4, 372, 440, 000      | 4, 325, 960, 200             | -46, 479, 800               |

The total amount of appropriations recommended in this bill certainly is a large sum of money, but these funds represent a capital investment in America—an investment which will add overall

strength and bring vast economic benefits to our Nation as a whole.

With these investments, our country will realize enormous new benefits through the prevention of floods and the



reclamation of barren wastelands, through improved waterway systems and increased use of our water resources, through the generation of electricity and the promotion of navigation—and through the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and national defense.

Mr. Chairman, projects of the nature funded in this bill have come under attack from time to time by certain national magazines and others, who characterize them as "pork barreling" and contend they are a waste of money. I disagree wholeheartedly with such short-sighted views. These projects are indeed investments—wise and prudent investments in America and a proper use of public funds.

Each year this committee screens hundreds of projects and recommends appropriations only for the most worthwhile. A great deal of screening and eliminating of projects is done in the legislative authorizing process even before the matter comes before the Appropriations Committee. Our committee then gives the closest possible scrutiny to each item to make certain that every project funded has a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and is worthwhile.

Every region and every section of the Nation will share in the projects included in this bill. It is a bill with a national purpose—one which recognizes the needs of every area of our country—truly an all-American bill.

One of the immediate benefits from these new starts, in resources development, is the increased employment which the projects will provide throughout the country. This is, to be sure, a side effect—an incidental benefit—but a benefit that will mean much to our country, at this time, and have a long-range benefit for the future.

These projects funded in this bill, are in all sections of our country and are, I repeat, investments in America.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Total appropriations of \$1,178,308,200 for, the rivers and harbors and flood control programs and activities of, the Corps of Engineers are provided in this bill. For general construction, we are recommending an appropriation of \$905,767,300. This includes funds for 306 construction projects and funds for engineering and design of 109 other projects. All of our 50 States are included in the list of construction projects and 35 are represented in the list of planning projects.

The Committee is recommending an appropriation of \$20,540,000 for the general investigations of the corps—\$795,000 more than the budget estimates and \$1,476,000 more than was appropriated for 1964. Funds provided under this heading are allocated to surveys and other navigation, beach erosion and flood control activities in all parts of the country—for 257 projects in areas including 44 States and Puerto Rico.

The amount recommended for flood control on the Mississippi and its tributaries—\$73,550,000—is \$1,690,000 above the budget estimates. Most of this increase is represented by two items the

Committee added to the 1965 channel improvement program—\$665,000 for Memphis reach and \$1 million for Terrene Landing revetment. For channel improvement generally, on the Mississippi the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$26,165,000. This is the largest item in the \$50,875,000 recommended for flood control construction projects. Included in this figure are \$1,400,000 for west Tennessee tributaries and \$600,000 for Memphis harbor.

The expanding activities of the corps are reflected in the \$158,676,000 appropriation recommended for general operation and maintenance. This is \$4,676,000 above the amount appropriated for 1964. In approving the full budget estimate, the Committee finds this increase justified by the rate at which additional projects are moving into the operation and maintenance stage.

A new appropriation item appearing in this bill is the \$4.5 million recommended for flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies. Appropriations for this function formerly were carried under the "operation and maintenance, general" heading. Disastrous occurrences of the last year, including floods in the Ohio Valley and the destructive tidal waves resulting from the Alaskan earthquake, underscore the timeliness and urgency of this new provision for emergency protection.

For general expenses of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the offices of the division engineers, activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the work of the Beach Erosion Control, we are recommending \$15,575,000—the full amount requested, and \$575,000 more than was appropriate for 1964.

#### IMPORTANT TENNESSEE PROJECTS ADVANCED

Among the great projects which are advanced by funds provided in this bill are several of particular interest in Tennessee. Three of these projects are the Cordell Hull Lock and Dam, the Percy Priest Dam and the Barkley Dam—each named after a distinguished former colleague.

Tennessee is one of the major areas affected by this public works appropriations bill through the programs and operations of the Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission, one of whose major installations is maintained and operated at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

To speed up construction of two of the important multipurpose dams now being built in Tennessee, the committee is recommending some additions to the \$35 million requested for the various projects of the Corps of Engineers in Tennessee.

Our committee has approved the \$35,348,000 budgeted for construction and operations on existing facilities in Tennessee and we have added increases in the appropriations for the Cordell Hull and Percy Priest projects, in line with the capabilities of the Corps of Engineers.

Our committee is recommending a \$1 million increase above the budget—which is the corps' capability—for continued construction of the Cordell Hull dam and lock on the Cumberland Riv-

er. The budget request was \$7.1 million and the amount recommended is \$8.1 million for the next year on this project. With the addition of the navigation lock feature, this project has assumed increased importance in the future economic development of the upper Cumberland region.

The bill carries an appropriation of \$10.1 million for continued construction of the Percy Priest Dam on the Stones River in Rutherford and Davidson Counties in Tennessee. Construction of this multipurpose dam, which will cost \$34 million when completed, will be speeded up from 3 to 6 months by the additional funds provided for fiscal 1965.

Our committee determined that expanded construction activity is well within the capability of the corps and it was the consensus that the economic benefits to be derived from these developments fully justify larger construction efforts.

A sum of \$15.4 million—the full amount requested—was approved by the committee for further construction of the Barkley Dam on the lower Cumberland. The first construction stage of this project—a \$145 million development for flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power generation—will be completed this year.

This bill also carries a recommendation for the transfer of \$100,000 in previously appropriated funds to enable the U.S. Engineers to conduct a reevaluation study of the Tennessee-Tombigbee water route. The proposed waterway would connect the Tennessee River in west Tennessee with the Tombigbee River in west central Alabama, thus giving an outlet to Mobile on the Gulf of Mexico. Development of this waterway would be of inestimable value to the South as well as the Nation as a whole.

The action taken for the reevaluation study, has the approval and recommendation of President Johnson. This action gives renewed emphasis that this important and long-range waterway link will be built.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The budget estimates for TVA as approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1965 included an appropriation request for \$50,915,000 for navigation, flood control, construction, and general administration.

There are no funds carried in the bill for TVA's power program. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating; and, as a profitable operation, returns running into the millions of dollars are made annually into the Treasury.

In providing funds for TVA's construction program for 1965, the committee has recommended a general reduction of \$2 million from the amount requested which should be readily offset by unobligated balances at the end of the current fiscal year.

The only other change made by the committee was a reduction of \$1 million from the \$6 million requested for land acquisition in TVA's Between the Lakes National Park development program. This will not result in a slowdown, since



the committee finds there is some carry-over of funds. The \$5 million additionally provided should bring an actual acceleration of land buying operations.

TVA directors assured our committee that facilities of the Between the Lakes National Recreation Area will be open to the public at the beginning of 1965. It is expected that this new park, bounded on one side by the Tennessee River and on the other side by the Corps of Engineers' Barkley Lake, will attract approximately 2 million visitors during the first year. With more than 300 miles of shoreline, it will provide unexcelled outdoor recreational opportunities on a large and varied scale. Land acquisition and development will proceed with final approval of this new appropriations bill.

Among the other funds for TVA provided in this bill are some \$1 million for tributary area development, including the Elk River development; \$9.8 million for further construction on the Nickajack Dam and Reservoir, some \$3 million for the Beech River multipurpose water control system, and \$3.6 million for multipurpose project operations in Tennessee and adjacent States.

Included in this bill is \$700,000 for the design of a TVA central operations building to be located on the Chickamauga Dam and Reservoir near Chattanooga. This TVA dispatch and operations office building, when completed, will consolidate all TVA offices and facilities now housed in some 18 different buildings in downtown Chattanooga and effect substantial savings in rental costs.

TVA is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollar-and-cent point of view, based on cash returns into the Treasury, but also from the point of view of TVA's contributions to the strengthening of our economy and our defense system.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out at this time that TVA is far ahead in its payments into the Treasury. The return to the Treasury out of TVA's power proceeds for fiscal 1964 is more than \$52 million. Over the 31-year TVA history, this agency has paid back into the Treasury more than \$480 million—almost one-half billion dollars.

In addition Federal agencies using TVA power have realized and are continuing to realize immense power-cost savings.

TVA provides a great service to the people living in the seven-State area it serves directly. TVA also returns great benefits to all the Nation. TVA is the world's greatest showcase of democracy in action.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

This bill carries \$318,013,000 in funds for the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

For the Bureau's construction and rehabilitation operations, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$182,433,000—\$409,000 more than the amount requested—to finance continued construction on about 30 major reclamation projects in nearly 20 States, plus 11 advance planning projects. Included in these recommended appropriations are \$55,280,000 for the California Central

Valley project, \$22.1 million for the Canadian River project in Texas, \$6.2 million for the Frypan-Arkansas project in Colorado, \$7,786,000 for the Weber Basin project in Utah and \$6.8 million for the Columbia Basin project in Washington.

For the Missouri River Basin project, the committee recommends appropriations of \$65,285,000 for construction, \$850,000 for advance planning, \$1,668,000 for investigations, and \$3,349,000 for other department agencies—a grand total of \$70,302,000.

The appropriation in this bill for the Upper Colorado river storage project is \$62.3 million—a drop of \$35,689,200 from the amount appropriated for 1964.

For operation and maintenance of the Bureau, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$40,219,000. This is \$2,219,000 above last year's appropriation for this purpose, an increase reflecting the completion of additional facilities for the Bureau.

We have approved \$2,650,000 for transfer to the GSA to start construction of the new Denver office building of the Bureau.

For the Bureau's general investiga-

tions, we are recommending \$10,354,000—the same amount provided for fiscal year 1964. This involves a reduction of \$146,000 in the budget estimate, and \$74,000 of that amount was budgeted for the Wood Canyon project, which the committee has disallowed because of lack of compliance with Government policy with respect to projects jointly considered by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The largest appropriation item included in this bill is for operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. The budget estimates for the AEC operating expenses for fiscal 1965 are \$2,323 million. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,261,073,000, representing a cut of \$61,927,000 from budget estimates.

The budget estimate for AEC plant and capital equipment was \$379 million; the amount recommended by the committee is \$363 million.

A breakdown of the budget estimates and the amounts recommended by the committee for operation of the various programs of the AEC are shown on the following table:

| Program                                              | Budget estimate | Recommended by the committee | Change from budget estimate |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Raw materials                                        | \$267,455,000   | \$267,455,000                |                             |
| Special nuclear materials                            | 401,500,000     | 395,000,000                  | —\$6,500,000                |
| Weapons                                              | 771,747,000     | 765,000,000                  | —6,747,000                  |
| Reactor development                                  | 497,900,000     | 490,000,000                  | —7,900,000                  |
| Physical research                                    | 222,000,000     | 210,000,000                  | —12,000,000                 |
| Biology and medicine                                 | 80,000,000      | 78,000,000                   | —2,000,000                  |
| Training, education, and information                 | 17,700,000      | 15,700,000                   | —2,000,000                  |
| Isotopes development program                         | 10,300,000      | 9,300,000                    | —1,000,000                  |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives          | 11,000,000      | 11,000,000                   |                             |
| Community program                                    | 9,035,000       | 9,035,000                    |                             |
| Program direction and administration                 | 76,780,000      | 76,000,000                   | —780,000                    |
| Security investigation program                       | 7,000,000       | 7,000,000                    |                             |
| Cost of work for others                              | 5,100,000       | 5,100,000                    |                             |
| Change in selected resources                         | —18,451,000     | —21,451,000                  | —3,000,000                  |
| Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources | —36,066,000     | —36,066,000                  |                             |
| Unobligated balance brought forward                  |                 | —20,000,000                  | —20,000,000                 |
| Total                                                | 2,323,000,000   | 2,261,073,000                | —61,927,000                 |

Reductions made by our committee include a net cut of \$7,965,000 that was made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the authorizing legislation.

The reduction of \$6,747,000 in the weapons program is based on experience showing there are considerable under-runs in costs compared with estimates in the budget presentations.

A reduction of \$6.5 million, in the special nuclear materials program, is based on similar underrun experience.

The reduction in the Pluto reactor development program includes a \$1.5 million cut that was made by the Joint Committee and a \$5.5 million cut made by our committee. As the committee report notes, the successfulness of the ramjet propulsion reactor powerplant has been amply demonstrated, but there exists no military requirement for this powerplant. As no engine system or vehicle to carry this reactor has thus far been developed, the committee sees no reason why further testing is necessary at this time.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—the authorizing committee—has reduced the physical research authorization by some \$4 million, and our committee has made an additional \$8 million cutback in the physical research expenditures by AEC.

Our committee is emphasizing for the third consecutive year that there must be better administrative control of this program. To quote from the committee's report, there must be "a tightening up in the process of selecting areas and subjects of research undertakings with greater emphasis on overall usefulness of the potential results."

BONNEVILLE AND OTHER POWER ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. Chairman, this is a well-balanced bill in many respects—a bill that has been drawn with particular concern for a meeting of minds and adherence to the broadest possible consensus. Illustrative of that concern is the committee's action in handling one of the more controversial items proposed in this bill—I refer to the proposed \$1 million budgeted for planning of a high voltage transmission line from the Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho.

The committee deferred final decision on this proposal. We directed that no funds be expended for any other purpose than good faith negotiations between interested parties on the proposition of wheeling Bonneville power to serve preference customers in the Federal marketing area of southern Idaho.



There was much testimony and support for the building of this transmission line. There was also testimony to the effect that private utilities in the areas could not supply all the power needed on an uninterruptable basis. The committee decided to defer action on this matter, however, pending further negotiations for a power wheeling contract.

The committee will at a future date determine whether private utilities in the area can and will supply the power needs and requirements of the area or whether the transmission line should be built at a later date.

In addition to disallowing the \$1 million budgeted for this project, the committee made other cuts totaling \$1,600,000 in the amounts budgeted for the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee recommends a total appropriation of \$41,200,000 for Bonneville construction projects, and \$14,980,000 for operation and maintenance of the Administration. Compared with last year's appropriations, these figures represent an increase of \$5,916,000 for construction and an increase of \$1,480,000 for operations and maintenance.

For the Southeastern Power Administration we have recommended the full amount requested for operations and maintenance—\$1 million, the same as last year.

For the Southwestern Power Administration, this bill provides \$2,610,000 for construction and \$1,680,000 for operation and maintenance. The committee cut \$160,000 from the amount budgeted for construction.

The appropriation recommended for operation and maintenance is \$180,000 above the budget estimate.

The Bonneville, Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations are power marketing agencies selling the power produced on projects in their areas to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, industrial users and others. The profits from the sale of power by each of these agencies go into the Federal Treasury.

Estimated revenues of these three Federal power agencies for fiscal 1964 are:

Bonneville: \$85.2 million, an increase of \$3 million over fiscal 1964.

Southeastern: \$26.4 million, an increase of \$1.3 million over fiscal 1964.

Southwestern: \$12.9 million, over the estimate for fiscal 1964.

#### PANAMA CANAL

Appropriations which finance our Canal Zone operations are repaid annually to the Treasury from revenues of the Panama Canal Company. The administration requested \$29,088,000 for operations in fiscal 1964. Our committee has recommended the full amount budgeted.

The Canal Zone Government has some 18,000 employees in the various civilian branches, such as the public school system, police and fire departments and other services provided for the Canal Zone. Of these, about 15,000 are Panamanians. The Governor asked for an allowance enabling him to add up to 80 new personnel. The committee recommends an increase in the limitation on

general administration expenses which will permit addition of half that number of new jobs requested.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Our only provision in this bill for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is an increase in the limitation on administrative expense—from \$429,000 in fiscal 1964 to \$450,000 in fiscal 1965. This great seaway now has an operating history of five seasons, during which tolls have been sufficient to cover payroll and operating expenses as well as to provide more than \$11 million for payment to the Treasury.

In testimony before the Committee, the Administrator of the Corporation, Mr. Joseph H. McCann, stated that though the Corporation still is behind in payments, "the practical success of the seaway is assured. There now seems no questioning of the fact that the waterway will reach its goal of 50 million tons during the early 1970's. And, while original estimates show the seaway's tonnage leveling off at 50 million, it has now been determined that this figure is conservative. Traffic is expected to rise to 60 million tons."

#### CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a big bill, a good bill—an all-American bill—providing for public works for all sections of the United States.

The funds carried in this bill will build up America, and help to make our country a stronger, more prosperous and a more secure Nation.

This bill should have the unanimous approval of the House and I urge its passage.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Appropriations Committee and its Public Works Subcommittee for their achievement in reporting out and bringing to the floor of the House a bill which, in my opinion, represents one of the foremost steps in water resource development in the United States that I have ever seen. In view of the fact that I am on the Committee on Public Works which has jurisdiction, among other things, over the water resource development of the Corps of Engineers, I am particularly gratified to find that the Appropriations Committee has given very serious consideration to appropriating funds to continue or to initiate those projects which my committee has authorized. This is evidenced by the fact that the total appropriation for rivers and harbors and flood control recommended by the committee is \$1,178,308,200. This is an increase of \$28,944,200 over the budget estimate. I am particularly interested in this because the Public Works Committee is very greatly concerned with the entire field of water resources, including not only the programs of the Corps of Engineers, but also a large part of the program for small watershed development of the Soil Con-

servation Service; in the water pollution control legislation which is now on the books and is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and a number of other public projects such as the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

An increasing number of articles in the press and in national publications indicate the ever-growing awareness by the American people of the importance of all elements of water resource development. This includes the control of floods; the improvement of waterways for navigation; the impoundment of waters for domestic, municipal, and industrial consumption; the abatement of sewage pollution; the use of our manmade lakes created by reservoirs for recreational use; the development of hydroelectric power; and the many other related water problems. These articles have dealt with the growing shortage of pure water and the need for effective measures to provide water suitable for use for the ever-growing population of this country. If these steps are not taken, we will be faced with an actual shortage of pure water prior to the turn of the century. These articles have also pointed out that the control of floods have represented one of the best investments the United States has ever made, and the projects designed for this purpose have returned more than three times their cost in the way of savings in property damage, not to mention the many intangible benefits such as prevention of loss of life, stabilization of the economy of communities and other incidental benefits. The tonnage borne by our inland waterway system has risen each year. The Ohio River alone carries far more tonnage than was ever visualized by those who planned the early locks and dams. These locks and dams are now being modernized to accommodate up-to-date tows and, when completed, will be one of the finest manmade navigable channels in the entire world.

The great ports of our Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts have been deepened and improved by the vision of those who foresaw the need for the accommodation of the tremendous amount of oceangoing traffic, both imports and exports, that are necessary for our national economy. One of the most outstanding developments in the world, visited by thousands from all over the world, is the great Tennessee Valley Authority program which not only prevents floods, provides for navigation, but furnishes electric power which has lifted the valley from one of the lowest points of economic depression to a position comparable to many other prosperous areas in the United States. I could cite many, many programs and projects which have been authorized by the Committee on Public Works, and it is all of this which makes me so proud to be a member of that committee.

I would like, as an example, in connection with the present appropriation bill, to indicate the effect that this will have on my own State of Alabama. Included in this bill is a total of \$16,500,000 for construction of four major projects, \$234,000 for planning on two other proj-



ects and \$40,000 for a study for flood control of the Warrior River and tributaries which I hope will eventually lead to an authorized project. The construction and planning amounts are to be applied to the following projects:

Claiborne lock and dam on the Alabama-Coosa River Basin for navigation has received a prior appropriation in the amount of \$460,000 for the initial stages of this project. The Appropriations Committee has included in the total of \$16,500,000, to which I referred, the sum of \$1 million to initiate construction.

The Miller's Ferry Dam, for navigation, power, and general multiple purposes, is included for a total of \$6 million. This project has already had appropriations in a total of \$3,624,000 and the amount in the 1965 fiscal year budget will permit the continuation of construction.

With respect to Jones Bluff lock and dam, also for multiple purposes, this project has already received \$666,000 for planning and the committee, I am pleased to say, has included \$134,000 which will complete the planning and permit the initiation of construction in fiscal year 1966.

One of the most important projects for which the Appropriations Committee is granting funds is the deepening and further improvement of the harbor and channel at Mobile. This is vital to the people of the State of Alabama and, indeed, to a much wider tributary area. The committee has included an amount of \$1,500,000 so that construction can be undertaken to deepen this project to 40 feet.

These foregoing projects are part of the Alabama-Coosa Basin and will be part of a full-scale development of the regions' water resources.

The basin is rich in natural resources and although it has supported in the past primarily an agricultural economy, times have changed and there is a rapid industrial expansion. The river drains 22,500 square miles and is undoubtedly one of the most underdeveloped rivers in the United States. The major cities of Birmingham and Mobile in Alabama, Chattanooga in Tennessee, and Atlanta in Georgia, with a combined population of 1½ million give this area within a 65-mile radius a total population of over 3 million persons.

We have heard much lately about the question of unemployment and what can be done about it. We have heard much lately about the full scale development of our national economy. An overall project such as the Alabama-Coosa is one of the prime examples of what can be done. With the many natural resources available in this area the combination of the natural wealth of the region and the development of the river will, I am sure, within a very short period of time being about a resulting increase of economic resources of the area and, at the same time, provide not only vitally needed flood protection for the region but the many other intangible benefits that a complete water resource development always brings with it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention the largest construction appropriation in the present bill—that of \$8

million for Holt lock and dam. This is one of the most important projects in my State and its completion will be greatly beneficial as a unit in the Warrior River system. The last authorized project, which I am sure you are familiar with, is the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in Alabama and Mississippi. The amount allowed by the committee is \$100,000 for continuation of planning, and I sincerely trust that we will all see the day when the vital connecting link between the Gulf of Mexico and the Tennessee River will be complete.

In closing, I would like again to express my gratitude and commendation to the members of the Public Works Subcommittee and to the members of the full Appropriations Committee for the untiring effort and the many long hours which they spent in hearings and in executive session prior to bringing this bill to the floor.

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, as has been said many times, this is a water bill. I do not mean a pork barrel bill, either; I mean a water bill. This is a bill which provides either for putting water on land or for keeping it off land. It also provides for the development of water and for the conservation of it.

As the chairman of the subcommittee so ably said, as times goes on this will be an even more important endeavor in which all Americans must be interested.

I come from an area in which there is an annual rainfall of 8 inches, if we are lucky. If we did not conserve water in the mountains and use it on the land down in the valleys, and for our growing cities, we would not only be short of water for baths but we would also be short of water for drinking. So those of us who know the value of water are particularly desirous of making certain that this is the best possible bill which we can pass for all of America.

This bill has been called a pork barrel bill, and I want to tell the Members that nothing makes me more irate than to have here this name. This is an all-America bill, as the gentleman from Ohio has often said.

It has been said that this is a bill which we use to help Members of Congress get reelected, that this is a bill by which we take the taxpayers' money and redistribute it. Certainly nothing is farther from the truth. The members of the legislative committees authorize these projects, and they as well as the members of the Appropriations Committee are very zealous concerning getting the best possible deal for the American taxpayer in this great task of conserving our natural resources.

I should like to compare the process of getting a project—either a reclamation project or a flood-control project—through Congress, to be built with public money, with the process of getting a

similar project built under our foreign-aid laws in other countries. I happen to serve on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, as well as on the Public Works Subcommittee, and I believe I am in a good position to compare the two.

If I were to start tomorrow to attempt to get a flood-control dam built in my district, it would be necessary for me to get the Corps of Engineers to survey the project. They would have to make engineering studies and estimates. They would have to make plans to justify the expenditure, and present them before the Public Works Committees of the House and of the Senate. It would be necessary to have an authorization for the project pass both Houses and be signed by the President. The Bureau of the Budget would have to put money in the budget for the project, at the beginning, for planning. Finally, there would be money for construction. If I were lucky, all of this might take less than 10 years.

On the contrary, if I sought to have a similar dam built in Ethiopia or in Egypt or in Iran or in Iraq, with foreign-aid money, the process would be something like this: The head of our AID mission in that country would negotiate with his "opposite number" in the government of that country. Plans would be drawn up. A commitment would be made by us. The engineering would be done. Then Washington would approve it, and immediately money would start to flow into the project. If they were very unlucky, Mr. Chairman, that might take 3 years.

So if anyone calls this public works bill a pork barrel bill, I suggest he should look at some of the real pork barrel projects under the foreign-aid program as conducted around the world.

I am not saying this as one who is opposed to all of the things we are doing in foreign aid, for I am not. I merely wish to emphasize, however, that in many instances the people of the United States are treating our friends around the world much better than we are treating ourselves. This is not an indictment of us. In fact, I suppose we can all take some pride and gratification in the fact that we are this type of people.

But the next time someone is tempted to write a column or a story calling the public works bill a pork barrel bill, I suggest he should reflect on the facts which I have just mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, as the next months and years go by the conservation of water in the Colorado River Basin is going to become even more important that it has been in the past. As we know, the upper Colorado storage project, one of the great reclamation projects of all time, is nearing the initial stage of its completion.

The lake behind Glen Canyon Dam is becoming filled to the extent that power will soon be manufactured by the great turbines which have been installed there, and the fruition of the Upper Colorado storage project will be in sight. Now comes the time for the people of the Lower Colorado Basin to begin to plan for the beneficial consumptive use of the water which has been allocated to the



Lower Colorado Basin and to which title has finally been settled by the famous but bloody case of Arizona against California.

Mr. Chairman, we are in high hopes that since the solution of this problem which has existed between two of the great States of the Southwest has been furnished by the Supreme Court, that these two States, their Representatives in the Congress, their Governors and State governments and all the entities involved may go forward together for the development of that lifegiving fluid which flows down the Colorado River.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. In your committee do you work on the changing of salt water to fresh water?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This is in the Interior Department budget. The money is voted in a bill which appropriates money for the Department of the Interior.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Thank you very much.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the distinguished lady that much progress has been made on desalinization of sea water and on demineralizing of brackish water. I think the lady would be interested to know that we are now desalinizing sea water and selling it for around 95 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. And we hope to get down to 30 cents, do we?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, that will be quite some time.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Yes, but that is where we are going.

Mr. JENSEN. But I think on the average the American people are paying for water in their homes now about 50 cents a thousand gallons. So we are gradually getting down to the point where the sea water that we desalt will be competitive with other water.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. I might also say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that I believe there is money in this budget for study and research into the use of nuclear fuels for the desalinization of water.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from New York is correct. This is in the section of the bill dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Could the gentleman tell me if there is any money in this bill to build the electrical power intertie between California and the Northwest?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is no money in this bill for that purpose. However, I should remind the gentleman from Washington that in the public works appropriation bill for last year there was an amount of \$8 million for the purpose of beginning the construction of that part of the interties which would be built by Federal agencies, contingent, however, on the passage of that piece of legislation which is known as the regional preference law. That law would protect the Pacific Northwest from having some preference customer outside of its area getting what would amount to a prior lien on power which is produced in the Northwest. Until this bill becomes law, no part of this \$8 million would be spent.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to return again to the Pacific Southwest water plan. This is a plan which envisages the construction of the central Arizona project to bring water from the Colorado River into the middle of Arizona for the use of the cities there and for supplemental water for the agricultural community. There would be no additional land put under cultivation. In addition, the initial plan provides for some help for and some enlargement of the California water plan.

It also provides for certain work to be done along the Colorado River for the conservation of water, the control of phreatophytes, control of seepage and the like. This is a very ambitious project but a very necessary one. It is not necessary for me to remind the Members of this House that the Pacific Southwest is one of the great growing regions of the country and one in which development will continue to occur. I do not think anyone could keep it from occurring. This will be one of the projects which is worthy of a Federal loan to develop water, and of course reclamation is always a loan, not a gift. The people of that great region will welcome your assistance for the purpose of helping them solve the greatest problem which they have facing them for their continuing development. Mr. Chairman, as time goes on and as the plans are perfected for the Pacific Southwest water plan, we will come before the House and the Senate for authorizing legislation and later for the appropriations necessary to put this plan into operation. It is my hope that the Members of the House and of the Senate will look upon this project as kindly as we now look upon projects which are ripe for development at the present time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee which authorized many of the projects taken care of by this particular appropriation bill, and as a member of another committee which authorizes some of the programs taken care of in this appropriation bill,

to wit: those of the Atomic Energy Commission, I wish to commend, as usual, the work of the committee. I commend my good friend, the chairman of the committee [Mr. KIRWAN], who is second to none in his allegiance, in his desire and in his efforts to further the growth of the United States of America and its human and natural resources. I also wish to commend his counterpart on the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] also, a friend of the constructive program of our Nation; and the members and staff of the subcommittee, as well as those of the full Committee on Appropriations, which Members and staff of the Congress have need of their recognized diligence, which they always show, in bringing before the House of Representatives a bill in which the inherent differences of approach to the problems involved have largely been taken care of, and a bill which is constructive in its approach to the necessary monetary problems of the areas concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss today if I did not say that I miss our late friend, the former chairman of the full committee, and the chairman of this particular subcommittee, Mr. Cannon, who also was attentive and sympathetic to these programs. I would say at the same time that I am glad to see his successor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] here on the floor as chairman of the full committee, watching the progress of this particular bill.

It is a pleasure to work with subcommittees chairmened by such distinguished Members as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and his counterpart on the minority side, and the chairman of the full committee. When it is understood that the authorizing responsibility is before a committee that has already acted upon programs and in many instances the authorizing committee is not too attentive to its responsibilities that will later be the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee. It is well to have complete understanding in the committee operations. The work that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has and its association with the committee and subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee concerned, in my opinion, has been most delightful, and also the same constructive cooperation exists between the staffs and the committee members.

Mr. Chairman, it has been publicized nationally that the water resources program has been increased as far as appropriations for fiscal 1965 are concerned. This is true, and I commend the executive department and the Appropriations Committee for what has been done. But I feel that it should be understood that the program for the reclamation activities for such period has been cut.

While I am disappointed with the amount included for the Bureau of Reclamation, I can find no fault with the action of the committee because the committee actually increased the amount recommended by the administration by \$263,000.

However, I would like to set the record straight with respect to the amount rec-



commended by the administration because spokesmen for the administration have stated on several occasions that this year's budget request for water resources development was increased over the appropriations made for fiscal year 1964. This statement is based upon the combined programs of the various agencies for water resources development.

The administration requested \$1,149,-364,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control or an increase of more than \$56 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1964. The administration requested \$317,750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation or a decrease of over \$36 million in the amount appropriated last year and a decrease of more than \$50 million in the amount requested by the administration for fiscal year 1964. In other words, while it is true that there has been no reduction in the overall water resources development program, the funds requested for the Bureau of Reclamation have been reduced while the funds requested for the Corps of Engineers program have been increased. Now, as I indicated to the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, I appreciate the President's efforts to reduce overall Federal expenditures to a minimum but I cannot agree with the reduction in the funds for the Reclamation program which, in my opinion, constitutes an investment in the future economic strength of our Nation.

I have appeared before the Public Works Appropriations Committee now for several years pleading for an annual reclamation construction program of at least \$300 million. Last year the administration requested \$299 million for construction. This year the requested amount was reduced by more than \$50 million. Many Members of this body are interested in legislation to authorize new reclamation projects. When you consider the fact that it will require more than \$2 billion to complete the projects which are presently under construction and that there are project authorization bills pending before my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs totaling more than \$2.7 billion, you can see what we are up against in considering new authorizations unless the annual level of spending for this meritorious program can be increased. It is completely inconsistent, it seems to me, for the administration to recommend that more and more projects be authorized without recommending at least sufficient funds annually to carry out an orderly construction program. It does not make sense for Congress to authorize projects that cannot be started until many years in the future. If we do, the plans simply get out of date and Congress loses control of the program, resulting in the situation we have in the Missouri River Basin at the present time.

Again, I want it understood that I am not criticizing the Appropriations Committee. I just want my friends who are interested in the reclamation program and in the development of the West to know that the program suffered a setback this year.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly wish to commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] who just preceded me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ASPINALL. I believe the approach which has been made by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] as to a comparison between the work that we do in the United States on some of these projects, especially the water resources projects, and what we permit to be done in like endeavors in our sister nations with our moneys is something that all of us should understand a little bit better. I believe that the criticism was well voiced.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I am both pleased and grateful that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to recommend the funding of the multipurpose and reclamation projects in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington. Very often my colleagues point out that this particular part of our great United States always does very well in this budget. I, in turn, have to point out that we are fortunate enough to be bounded by both the Columbia and the Snake Rivers which is a geographical coincidence. This is an area which offers so much in natural resources for the economical development of the Pacific Northwest to benefit not only this area, but the entire Nation.

It is with regret that I note that the committee has not allowed sufficient funding to enable certain projects in my district to go forward, however. I do believe the beginning of construction on the authorized Lower Granite Dam is economically justified, and in fact, would be less costly to start now, than to delay.

I also feel that now is the time to direct the Corps of Engineers to investigate the feasibility of including navigation locks in the authorized Asotin Dam on the Snake River, because it appears such locks are highly desirable and it could be a serious mistake not to include them.

Of paramount concern is the fact that the funds allowed for the Columbia Basin reclamation project are insufficient to allow construction on this half-completed project to go along in an orderly manner. The Governor of my State, the Honorable Albert Rosellini, responsible witnesses from the project area, came to Washington, D.C., earlier this year to join me and other Members of Congress in presenting sound evidence that the budgeted appropriation was insufficient to provide for on-schedule, economical, orderly development. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am convinced that the able and respected members of the Appropriation Committee are well aware of

the needs I have just enumerated, and I assume that their decision not to include this additional funding was not pinpointed against these projects. The decision, rather some members have indicated, was based on overall budgetary considerations.

I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks just made by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] on the budgetary cut made for reclamation. Fifty million dollars is a distressingly large cut in this area which returns such manifold benefits to the Nation in relation to taxpayer funds invested.

I would not support the additional requests enumerated if I were not convinced, however, that the Federal obligation in these areas is economically sound and fully justified. It is my hope, therefore, that before the bill we are today considering is fully processed by both bodies of the Congress, the funds can be included.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say it is a real pleasure to me to serve on the subcommittee handling this bill. This is my third year as a member of the subcommittee, although I have worked with the members of this committee on other matters throughout the years. I do not know of a committee that is more fair or that deals with the membership of the Congress in all areas of the country in a more impartial manner than does the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details of this bill. It speaks for itself, and it has been explained fully by those who preceded me. I do take this time, however, to cite an illustration that I have used several times in years past.

I am on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Sometimes I think I have perhaps done more for defense by being on the Agricultural and Public Works Appropriations Committees than perhaps on the other.

Some time ago, in World War II, when we were trying to get prepared for a possible all-out war effort, I walked back over to the House from the hearing room with Joe Fowler, who headed the National Production Authority. As we walked along he said "If I was Stalin—" and it was in his day, "and if I wanted to wreck the United States of America, I would declare 10 years of peace."

That was a shocking statement. He proceeded, and said: "Think of it, if all the men were out of the service and had no jobs, if we closed down all munitions plants, if we canceled out all the war contracts, if we stopped all of these things connected with the war effort, think about what it would do to our economy."

I realized we had the greatest material prosperity that we ever enjoyed in our



history, yet I could see what he was talking about. Yet surely it could not be necessary that we have war or preparation for war to have material prosperity. As I studied the matter, I began to realize it was not war or preparation for war, as such, which made for material prosperity but it was the extra effort. If you carry it one step further you can see that while in war you use up your natural resources, you burn up your fuel, you destroy your timber and end up a poorer country. If we could divert that same degree of extra effort to harnessing our streams, developing our harbors, reforesting the hillsides, and developing our water resources, we would have the same prosperity and a richer country. The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the American people would back you in expending that much effort on our own country. That certainly cannot be said of this subcommittee and of our chairman.

I want to say the members of the subcommittee, and particularly the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], pay attention to our needs, and may I say further if this country does not pay proper attention to itself it will not be the fault of the gentleman from Ohio or the members of this committee. We joined with him and many others in overriding a Presidential veto in 1959, saving 62 new starts. As I said then:

The more our obligations, the more we owe, the greater our difficulties, the more imperative it is that we look out for our own country, because it is the basis upon which we must meet all these other problems.

Again, I compliment my colleagues on this committee. They have dealt as fairly as they possibly could with every segment of the country.

In conclusion, may I say, the whole Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our chairman, MIKE KIRWAN. Always he has led the fight to protect America, pointing out to all that the funds in this bill are really an investment in America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my deepest thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and the other members of the subcommittee for their consideration and understanding in incorporating under title II, the Department of the Interior, the language at the bottom of page 11 which reads as follows:

*Provided further, That no funds shall be made available under this appropriation for the construction in Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of the interceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit which terminates at any point east of Port Chicago.*

This pertains to a difficult problem which has arisen in California in connection with the proposed construction of an interceptor drain for the San Luis project. The Bureau of Reclamation originally announced plans that would terminate this interceptor drain in the middle of the Sacramento-San Joaquin

Delta. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the largest pool of fresh water in our State. We depend on it for a source of fresh water for the Contra Costa Canal, which serves practically all of my district, and the Delta Mendota Canal, which serves most of the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Under a State law passed 4 years ago, there is now also under construction a State project which will pump water from the delta pool down to southern California. The proposed interceptor drain which would discharge water at Antioch Bridge in the middle of the delta would be discharging impure, polluted, alkaline water right in the middle of the fresh water pool on which Contra Costa County, the western San Joaquin Valley, and the southern part of the State are going to be dependent for fresh water.

The Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has rendered a strong report against this proposed terminal point. I quote from the report under date of November 20, 1963, from the San Francisco regional office of the U.S. Public Health Service, sent to the Central Valley Regional Water Pollution Control Board in California which states:

As a result of these studies, we have concluded that a discharge to the San Joaquin River in the vicinity of the Antioch Bridge is extremely undesirable because of the pollution problem that will inevitably develop in this area."

The purpose of the amendment which the committee with its understanding has been kind enough to add to this bill would be to bar the termination of this drain in the middle of the delta in the vicinity of the Antioch Bridge and would in fact, bar the termination of the drain at any point east of Port Chicago, which is about 10 miles farther down toward San Francisco Bay. The Antioch Bridge is above the confluence of the San Joaquin and the Sacramento Rivers. It is on the San Joaquin River. During the summer months there is no noticeable flow in the San Joaquin River. This means that at high tide the water is being pushed upstream. Just 3 or 4 miles above the Antioch Bridge are the pumps for the Contra Costa Canal, and just above that the pumps for the Delta Mendota Canal. This means that this discharge of alkaline waste water from the drain if discharged at the Antioch Bridge would be pulled by the pumps up into these canals, which are the source of the domestic water, the irrigation water, and the industrial water for Contra Costa County and the western San Joaquin Valley, and would therefore defeat the whole purpose of the San Luis drain.

Therefore, the committee through its deep understanding has been of great help to the people who want to protect this fresh source of domestic water, irrigation water and industrial water and have added this amendment to the bill to be sure this drain will not be discharging right in the middle of this fresh water pool.

The citizens of our district want to join me in their thanks to the members of this committee for their understanding and their helpfulness.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the work of the chairman and the members of this great subcommittee on public works. It is with reluctance that I rise today to discuss one portion of the bill concerning the Panama Canal which, in my estimation, need to be called to the attention of the Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a situation in which the resources of the Panama Canal Company are in jeopardy of further dissipation as part of a foreign policy objective to try to appease or soften the demands of the Republic of Panama for eventual ownership and control of the canal. We are talking now about installations inside the Canal Zone—U.S. property. For instance, this involves some piers located physically within the Canal Zone, subject to complete jurisdiction, and ownership, and control by the Panama Canal Company for the Government of the United States, but which are coveted by some of the rich families of the Panamanian oligarchy. They want possession in the name of the Republic of Panama—ownership, or at least full control. The Congress has steadfastly opposed the further surrender of our treaty rights within the Canal Zone, except and unless by treaty. I think it would be a violation of law if the piers were turned over to Panamanian interests, or if the commissaries and other service facilities in the Canal Zone were given or rented or leased or sold to the Republic of Panama or to Panamanian commercial interests subject to Panamanian jurisdiction—we have never permitted any such thing in the Canal Zone in the 61 years since the original treaty was signed.

We wrote this amendment into the public works appropriation bill last year—it was done in the Appropriations Committee and it went through the House and through the Senate and became law, even though the President, in signing the bill, held to the opinion it was probably an unconstitutional intrusion by the legislative upon the prerogatives of the executive branch but he nevertheless added:

It is entirely proper for the committees to request information with respect to the disposal of property, and I recognize the desirability of consultations between officials of the executive branch and the Congress. Therefore, it is my intention to treat the provision as a request for information and to direct that the appropriate legislative committees be kept fully informed with respect to the disposal and transfer actions taken by the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. Chairman, that was the President's comment on this provision in signing the bill last year, but as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal I am of the opinion that it means only that we would be notified after the fact rather than be consulted in advance on a matter so vital to the country under the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are in deep trouble in the Canal Zone if we give away our rights—surrender them—in an attempt



to appease the ultranationalist elements which killed our soldiers and jeopardized the safety of civilians and the safety of the Canal itself last January. The security problems would be immense if we gave away the piers inside the Zone, and if we turned the service activities of the Canal Company over to private commercial interests subject not to our jurisdiction but to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama—yet operating inside the Canal Zone itself.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I am going to offer an amendment to this bill which was written into the appropriation bill last year, as I said, but which was deleted from the bill this year.

The language of the amendment would prevent the Panama Canal Company from disposing of any real property or any rights to the use of real property by transfer, lease, or otherwise first obtaining the approval of the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this brief time to commend my colleague from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, and the members of the committee for what I consider to have been an arduous and difficult task well completed in the preparation of this bill.

In the Ohio Valley since World War II more than \$18 billion worth of new industry has been constructed, much of it in the chemical industry. The future prosperity of these existing plants and the future growth of the Ohio Valley depend in great measure upon adequate navigation facilities.

This bill will provide for the continued improvement of facilities along the Ohio River.

For the Belleville locks and dam there is \$16.5 million for construction.

For the Pike Island locks and dam there is \$7,539,000 for construction.

For the continued construction of the Racine locks and dam there is \$6.2 million.

There is planning money for two very important future dam and lock improvements on the river. For the Hannibal locks and dam there is \$230,000. For the Willow Island lock and dam there is \$325,000.

There is also \$325,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Ohio Valley and the tributaries of the Ohio River. I am hopeful that the Muskingum survey can be included in this amount.

The future of the Ohio Valley depends upon these in great measure, and I thank the chairman and the members of the committee personally for the attention they have given to the problems of the great Ohio Valley.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

(Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate my

strong support of the appropriation for continuing construction of the Eau Galle River flood control project at Spring Valley, which is located in my home district in Wisconsin. This item is part of the public works appropriation bill we are considering today.

An appropriation of \$400,000 for the Eau Galle project was included in the President's budget request for the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers for fiscal 1965. I am pleased that the House Appropriations Committee has retained the full amount requested for Eau Galle in reporting out the public works appropriation bill. I urge my colleagues in the House to do likewise.

This Eau Galle appropriation will be the third one to be made for construction of the long-awaited flood control project in the Spring Valley and Elmwood area. Last year, \$200,000 in construction funds were okayed by Congress, and \$340,000 had been made available for construction in fiscal 1963. Previously, \$570,000 had been appropriated over a 3-year period for planning the project.

Mr. Chairman, the history of Spring Valley reveals that flood records date back as far as 1894 and describe damage to roads, bridges, homes, and business places. The 1934 flood took one life, and two deaths are linked indirectly to the catastrophic flood of September 17, 1942.

That flood had been preceded by an earlier flood in May of the same year, which did considerable damage to both the business and residential areas of Spring Valley. Downstream from the village, railroad embankments and highways were washed out, bridges were damaged, and cultivated fields were inundated.

Residents in the Eau Galle valley had hardly recovered from the May flood when they were deluged again. Few buildings in Spring Valley escaped damage as a 16-foot wall of water moved through the community. Sixteen residences and 19 business places were completely destroyed, and the average damaged home and public building could not be reoccupied for about 30 days.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Spring Valley refused to be defeated. They rebuilt and cleaned up their town in an amazing and heart-warming display of courage and civic spirit and pride. Meanwhile, they continued to work with the Federal Government toward the establishment of the Eau Galle River flood control project which, when completed, will insure that the flood-splashed history of the Spring Valley area will not be repeated.

The Eau Galle project dates back to 1941, when the Senate Commerce Committee adopted a resolution requesting a review of the Corps of Engineers report on the Chippewa River and its tributaries. The Corps of Engineers started preliminary survey work on the Eau Galle Dam in 1942 as part of an overall Chippewa River project, but World War II halted all work on civil works projects.

Later, the Corps of Engineers approved Eau Galle River as a separate

project. It subsequently received the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget.

In 1955, I introduced a bill in the House to authorize the Eau Galle Dam. This measure was incorporated in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, which was passed in 1956 by the 84th Congress and received a pocket veto from President Eisenhower. He also vetoed a similar bill approved in 1957 by the 85th Congress. Authorization of the Eau Galle project finally came in 1958, when the President signed the revised omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Spring Valley have complied with all the stipulations set up by the Corps of Engineers as conditions for participation of the Federal Government in this project. The Eau Galle Dam is now under construction. I urge that construction funds continue to be appropriated as needed so that the project can be completed without further delays. Only then will the people of the Eau Galle River valley be freed from the nagging fear that rising waters will again wash away their homes and businesses and threaten their lives.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In my judgment, the entire House should recognize the outstanding work done by the great Committee on Appropriations in this bill.

I believe the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, could appropriately be called "Mr. America" for the contribution he has made to the development and strengthening of our country and its great natural resources.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the other distinguished members of this great committee are among America's unsung heroes in the building of America, through their consistent support of water resource development throughout the land.

The committee's able staff has worked competently and hard in preparing this important appropriations bill, and has made a contribution for which all of us are deeply grateful. I wholeheartedly support the bill and urge its approval.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the committee for doing a good job. I believe we are building assets for the American people, and making progress for the benefit of the whole country, by this public works construction program.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress one project in my district, the Chartiers Valley flood control project, which is a vital necessity to the people of this large industrial valley for the safety and protection of their families, their homes, the plants, industries, and their jobs.

Congressman THOMAS MORGAN has worked with me to advance the study by the U.S. Army Engineers, as have the



two Pennsylvania U.S. Senators, Senator JOSEPH CLARK and Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Under resolution of the Public Works Committee, requested by me, there has been provided to date \$230,500 by Congress for the study and preparation of the report by the U.S. district engineer for the western district of Pennsylvania. This study was started by the Army Engineers on February 7, 1958, and on final approval of the report by the chief of U.S. Engineers in Washington, was forwarded by the Secretary of the Army on January 28, 1964, to the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget has now approved the Chartiers Valley flood control project, and the program costing in total \$16,620,000 in Allegheny County my district, and \$3,655,000 for the Washington County section—Congressman THOMAS MORGAN's district—has been forwarded to Congress, and is now before the House Public Works Committee.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved \$9,320,000 as the Federal contribution of the Allegheny County part, and \$2,887,000 for the Washington County part. I have learned that the present administration and the House Public Works Committee do not plan for an omnibus public works authorization bill in this session of Congress, but only next year. I will read from the letter of the House Public Works Committee of June 10, 1964, to me as follows:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1964.

Re Chartiers Creek Basin, Pa., House Document 302, 88th Congress.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: As you know, the report of the Corps of Engineers relative to Chartiers Creek Basin, Pa., was submitted to the Congress on May 6, 1964. In confirmation of my previous conversations with you relative to this matter, to the best of my knowledge there are no present plans for the House Committee on Public Works to hold hearings and report out an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill this session of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,  
CLIFTON W. ENFIELD.

This failure to take action in Congress leaves the Chartiers Valley flood control project without the necessary authorizing legislation. Hence, the House Appropriations Committee has left this emergency project out of the present public works appropriation bill, as it did many other unauthorized projects.

I am advised the House Appropriations Committee included no project without authorization in the present public works appropriation bill. In fact, 108 Members of Congress have projects they want to include in this legislation, but because there are no prior authorizations, none of these projects have been included in this public works appropriation bill by the House Appropriations Committee.

Unfortunately there is no authorization for the Chartiers Valley flood control project, so that it cannot be put in the bill by amending. I have prepared such an amendment which I have with

me as the Members can see, for both the Washington County and Allegheny County parts of the program. I understand from both sides that there would be a point of order made against it if such an amendment were proposed at this time to the bill. Therefore, I will not offer the amendment as both Congressman MORGAN and I feel it cannot be considered by the House today. All this project needs is \$60,000, according to our local U.S. district engineer for the coming fiscal year, 1965, for both portions of the project, to initiate preliminary planning and preliminary surveys and borings. Col. B. de Melker, U.S. Army district engineer, Pittsburgh district, advised me \$60,000 would be enough to carry this \$20 million emergency project in his telegram to me of April 30, 1964, in answer to my telegram to him of April 29, 1964.

MR. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

MR. JENSEN. Of course, the committee is well aware of the gentleman's great interest in this project. He has urged that we make an appropriation to start the surveys for it. However, the fact of the matter is that the project has not been authorized. Had it been authorized, I could assure my good colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], that the committee would have looked with favor on his request and they would have no doubt included the funds which he has requested for it.

MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Thank you for your good comments on my work for the Chartiers Valley flood control program, as we do need this project on an emergency basis for flood protection, and to help this valley which has chronic high unemployment. Coming from the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, your remarks are encouraging to me. May I thank the gentleman for his good comments, and second, I thank him for his cooperation. Likewise I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who today said to me when I consulted with him that you will get it next year. The studies and engineers' report have been made, but it was too late by the time the U.S. Bureau of the Budget got the favorable report to act on it and get the program voted upon by this Congress in the current budget.

Today I have consulted individually with both Pennsylvania U.S. Senators, Senator JOSEPH CLARK and Senator HUGH SCOTT, and they have both said the Chartiers Valley flood control project will continue to have their full cooperation.

I will be glad to continue my work with our two Pennsylvania U.S. Senators, Senator JOSEPH CLARK and Senator HUGH SCOTT, as well as my friend and neighboring Congressman, THOMAS MORGAN, and our local officials, upon a nonpartisan and mutually helpful basis, as we have been proceeding, to get the earliest possible action on the Chartiers Valley flood control program.

MR. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the consideration given by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and other members to the pressing flood-control problems of the district I represent the 20th Congressional District of Illinois.

I express the thanks of thousands of farmers and other property owners in the Mississippi and Illinois River bottom areas. The subcommittee has been most generous in giving its time and attention to these problems, and in responding to them.

MR. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee and especially the chairman for their leadership in water development and the conservation programs of the past as well as for what they have done in this regard in this bill. In Montana we live in some areas with too much water too soon and in other areas with very little water at all. In our recent experience last week we would have much greater destruction of life and property from floods from the mountains were it not for the already established projects constructed under appropriations from this committee. We are very grateful in Montana and, of course, we look forward to further development and to further ability to fight the floods which we are subject to while at the same time diverting this water to useful and progressive uses, such as irrigation, recreation, power development, and the like.

Projects heretofore provided by investment by this committee in Montana's rivers saved us from worse floods than we experienced last week.

In the case of the Flathead River the flood last week from the Middle Fork and the North Fork amounted to 150,000 cubic feet per second as compared with the previous record of 1894 amounting to 135,000 cubic feet per second. But this year the flood would have been more than 210,000 cubic feet per second were it not for Hungry Horse Dam. This great multipurpose dam held back the entire flow of South Fork of the Flathead—a flow of more than 61,000 cubic feet per second.

The Sun River in Montana, which flooded tens of thousands of acres of farmland and the west suburbs of the city of Great Falls, would have flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland and literally washed away portions of cities were it not for the Gibson Reservoir of the Bureau of Reclamation holding back the larger portion of the mountain flood.



The Marias Dam of Bureau of Reclamation on the Marias River protected downstream communities and contained the entire flood of Birch, Dupuyer, and Cutbank creeks which had wrought great destruction of life and property upstream.

The Canyon Ferry Dam on the Missouri absolutely saved the city of Great Falls from other flooding by holding back the Missouri, while the excesses of the Sun rampaged its excesses.

The projects in this bill, Beaver Creek—part of Milk River—Libby Dam on the Kootenai River, and the several projects on the Missouri will further promote flood control. But more than that the projects will—everyone of them either directly or indirectly—develop electric power, provide irrigation and reclamation, as well as supply fish and wildlife in addition to pure water for recreation. Yes, and all of them support navigation.

We are grateful in Montana for the savings and benefits of the existing projects. We trust they will be examples for continued future investments in water conservation and development, and in flood control, in Montana and everywhere in the country.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this legislation before the House today contains a number of provisions for projects in Florida. Among those are projects in the Sixth Congressional District. I am particularly pleased that the distinguished Appropriations Committee has seen the merit of these projects, and approved funds for their development.

Among the projects listed in the bill are Everglades National Park, Martin County, Fla., both of which are surveys, and construction items for the central and southern Florida flood control project, the West Coast Intracoastal Waterway, port of Palm Beach, Port Everglades, and reimbursement to local interests for expenses incurred as part of a beach erosion project in Palm Beach County.

I urge that the House adopt the Appropriations Committee's action and approve the funds specified for these projects so vital to the continued orderly growth of Florida and the Nation.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not impose on the time of this body, but I come before you once again to cite particular provisions of this measure. They are of vital interest to the citizenry of my district and State.

Two of the five Rhode Island projects recommended by the Corps of Engineers are of deep concern to my district: the Fox Point hurricane barrier, for which \$1,857,000 is included for construction; and the Lower Woonsocket flood control project for which \$2 million is included for construction. Both of these projects have been authorized previously and are well underway—the Fox Point barrier is approximately three-fourths completed and the Woonsocket project will be 50 percent completed this year.

Hurricanes and floods in previous years caused millions of dollars in property damage as well as untold hardship and deprivations to the individuals affected. Appropriation of these funds to

continue construction of these two projects will afford the industries and citizens of these communities assurances of security and protection from the future onslaught of such disasters.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to commend the committee for its thorough work and fine presentation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11579, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1965, includes the very substantial sum of \$10 million to continue the construction work on the flood control project for St. Louis, Mo. This will bring to \$44,710,000 the total amount of Federal funds made available since the start of the project authorized by Public Law 256 of the 84th Congress approved August 9, 1955. At that time the entire Federal cost was estimated at more than \$100 million. Changes in some of the designs and other economies have reduced the estimate of Federal costs to \$85,600,000.

The money made available in this appropriation bill will enable the Army engineers to bring the project, by June 30, 1965, to within 52 percent of completion. The target date for completion is June of 1968. Once in place, the levee work and related facilities will protect more than 600 major industries and commercial enterprises within the corporate limits of the city of St. Louis. Mr. Chairman, this project will be a good investment for the Government of the United States and the taxpayers of the United States because it will prevent very substantial flood losses which are deductible for income tax purposes and thus a drain on the tax receipts of the United States as well as on the economy of the Nation.

I know it is popular to speak of the public works appropriation bill as "the pork barrel bill," even though many of the newspapers which do so and which tend to ridicule this kind of Federal spending nevertheless recognize the importance of individual projects in their own areas to the economy and the protection and the future of their own communities or localities. The late Clarence Cannon, who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee, of which he was also chairman, was understandably impatient with the criticisms which were directed at this particular bill each year because he knew from close personal study of the waterways of our country the vital role that they played in commerce and the hazards which arose from the periodic flooding of our rivers. No Member of Congress was more of a foe of unnecessary Government spending than Clarence Cannon, but no one was more aware of the importance of the funds provided each year in this appropriation bill.

We in St. Louis will always be grateful to his vision and his leadership in this field, and the tremendous help which he gave to us in getting this project underway at a time when the Budget Bureau had accorded it a low priority as a "new start." The project is now approaching 40 percent of completion, thanks primarily to the help he gave us in getting it started 8 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our

colleague from Ohio, Congressman KIRWAN, a worthy successor to Clarence Cannon as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, and also the other members of the subcommittee, in recommending in this bill the full budget amount of \$10 million for St. Louis.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my grateful thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and to the full committee for what they have done in this bill to help Arkansas preserve its land, its wood, and its water. This will be a great heritage to leave to our children and our children's children.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 11579, before the House today, carries with it an appropriation for continued construction of the Kinzua Dam at Warren, Pa., in the amount of \$27 million.

This amount is the largest appropriation for any project in Pennsylvania and ranks as the fourth largest in the Nation.

The size of the appropriation is commensurate with the great importance of the construction of the Kinzua Dam. It will provide flood protection for a large area of Pennsylvania, and Ohio as well. The recreational opportunities that will be afforded the people of a large area will mean tremendous enjoyment, health, and comfort for all who will have the privilege of making use of this fine new facility.

In addition to the appropriation for the Kinzua Dam, there is also an appropriation for another project in the 23d District—\$3,200,000 for continued construction of the Curwensville Reservoir which also is a vitally important flood control project in central Pennsylvania.

It is estimated that the great flood which hit the Curwensville area this spring would not have occurred if the reservoir had been in operation, thus saving millions of dollars in damages.

As a Congressman, I am pleased to support these projects as money well spent for the people back home. It does not represent squandering of the taxpayers' money as do the worthless donations from us that are literally squandered by foreign nations and serve no useful purpose.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill is of great importance to the people of Indiana and more particularly to the people of my congressional district. Included are funds for three major flood control projects, the Mississinewa, the Salamonie and the Huntington. These projects not only provide necessary flood control but are drastically changing the complexion of my section of the country. Each of these projects are under construction. This means that towns are being relocated, cemeteries are being relocated, roads are being changed, new bridges built, the course of streams are being changed and new communities are being built. A new water wonderland is beginning to take shape.

The Mississinewa Reservoir is the largest of the three. The dam itself is 8,310 feet in length and is 140 feet high. It



will have a permanent pool of 1,280 acres, a seasonal pool during the months of June, July, August and September of 3,180 acres and a maximum flood pool of 12,830 acres. At various places around the pool will be located recreation areas varying in size from 10 to 1,165 acres. The Salamonie Reservoir is located 3.1 miles from the point where the Salamonie joins the Wabash River. The Salamonie Dam is 6,940 feet in length and 130 feet high. There will be a permanent pool of 976 acres, a seasonal pool of 2,855 acres and a maximum flood pool of 9,340 acres. There will be five access or recreation areas around the pool which vary in size from 10 to 1,342 acres in size. The Huntington Reservoir is the smallest of the three reservoirs under construction. The dam itself will be 6,260 feet in length and 90 feet in height. The permanent pool will be 500 acres in size and the seasonal pool will be 900 acres in size. In the event of severe flooding there will be a capacity of 29 acres of storage. The recreation areas are in the planning stage and the number and size of these areas has not been announced.

For those of us who love the great outdoors and who are interested in conserving God-given natural resources, I see great opportunities as these reservoirs come into being. Thousands of acres will be preserved in their natural form. This in turn will provide a natural habitat for wild animal and bird life which are rapidly diminishing in numbers. The development of these reservoirs as three of the greatest fishing "holes" in the Midwest cannot be overlooked. Recreation has not been the goal of these projects; however, we would be remiss if we did not exploit the opportunity we have for using these reservoirs as a means of supplying for our people recreation facilities which if properly developed will be more useful, more beautiful, and more attractive than anything we now find in the Midwest. I, for one, am hopeful local interests will cooperate fully with the Federal and State Governments in planning the development of these areas and that there be an insistence that a plan of development and growth be followed.

These projects are already making a tremendous impact on the central part of Indiana. The economy of the area is being affected with the promise of enhancement of the economy beyond the dreams of even the most serious and aggressive advocates of the projects. Because of the location of these projects Indiana will be a more attractive place for industry.

The enticement of basic industry into the area will assure Indiana and more particularly north central Indiana of its place in a rapidly growing economy. The presence of good, clean water and plenty of it, the protection from floods, the low flow control which will permit a constant flow of water through the streams below the dams, and, of course, the availability of recreational facilities of the finest outdoor type will be of great help in the industrial development of our area. Mr. Speaker, although I have barely touched on the potential these

projects offer, I would want the House to know of my great excitement and enthusiasm for them. I urge that the bill pass.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my personal appreciation to the members of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations for the special attention they gave my request for inclusion in this bill of \$300,000 for the planning of the Tioga-Hammond Reservoir. As I explained in my statement to that hard-working subcommittee, this project should prove to be of immense value to sections of my congressional district in New York.

In my many conversations with members of the subcommittee and the full committee, I sought to bring out that the objections and concerns which had been expressed earlier by some had been dispelled and that their arguments had been met. In these discussions, I was afforded the fullest opportunity to present the merits of the project, which I endorse so strongly. The willingness of the committee to listen to the details of the project and to hear me out in urging inclusion of this amount is typical of this subcommittee.

The Tioga-Hammond Reservoir is a worthwhile project. I support it enthusiastically, and have established that the Corps of Engineers can effectively use the sum of \$300,000 included. This item has my support.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the public works appropriation bill before the House today contains a number of vital projects for the 24th Pennsylvania District, where flooding is a major problem.

Many sections of northwestern Pennsylvania suffer from floods each year. It is only through the combined efforts of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that this flooding can be eliminated.

The Soil Conservation Service has developed an effective program of flood control that has progressed satisfactorily, curtailing or eliminating some of the flooding in the Mercer-Crawford-Erie district.

The Army Engineers have also planned control measures that—when they become a reality—will stop the flooding that has caused millions of dollars in damages annually in northwestern Pennsylvania.

These projects are urgently needed to bring relief to property owners in the 24th district.

#### SHENANGO RESERVOIR

The 1965 Federal works budget includes \$11,300,000 for continuing work on the \$36-million Shenango River Reservoir near Sharpsville in Mercer County, scheduled to be finished in June 1965.

Approval of the \$11,300,000 allocation will insure the completion of the reservoir on time.

In March of this year the Shenango River overflowed its banks, causing thousands of dollars in damages to the Sharon area. This flood forced the closing of a school and at least five roadways.

Sharon merchants spent from \$75,000 to \$100,000 to prepare for the flood.

The flood of January 1959 was the most severe causing an estimated \$4,900,000 in damages in the Sharon sector.

The Shenango reservoir will control more than 1,200 square miles of the Beaver Valley watershed and will be operated as a unit of a coordinated reservoir system for flood protection in the Shenango, Beaver, and Ohio River valleys.

If the reservoir had been completed before the flood period this year, damages in the amount of \$2,331,000 would have been prevented, according to the Army engineers.

#### FRENCH CREEK BASIN

The budget also includes \$100,000 for advanced engineering and design for the proposed Union City reservoir on French Creek in Erie County, \$60,000 for the Woodcock Creek reservoir, and \$25,000 for the Muddy Creek reservoir, both in Crawford County. The last two sums are for planning. The dams will comprise a three-dam system of flood control for the French Creek Basin.

Floodings in the past have severely disrupted the economies of Meadville and other communities in the basin. The spring floods this year almost completely isolated the city by cutting off all of the roadways but one leading into the city.

In April 1947, some 7,000 acres of rural land and some 600 acres of urban land were under flood waters.

The engineers have noted in reports that the average annual primary flood damages in the Meadville area is estimated at \$1,260,000. Had the three dams been in existence at the time of the 1964 floods they would have prevented damage in the following amounts: \$643,000 Woodcock; \$643,000 Muddy Creek, and \$1,284,000 Union City.

#### PORT DREDGING AT ERIE

The 1965 budget did not contain an allocation to complete the last major dredging program to place the port of Erie in a competitive position with other Great Lakes oceangoing ports.

We in Pennsylvania feel that our only lake port has a great potential and that its development would help stabilize the economic status of northwestern Pennsylvania.

On behalf of the people of Erie, I want to thank the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations for recognizing the need for a better port by approving \$25,000 for predredging studies. It is my hope that \$725,000 can be allocated in the 1966 budget for the actual deepening of the harbor.

Dredging at Erie Harbor was authorized by the 1962 River and Harbor Act, as recommended in House Document No. 340, 87th Congress, 2d session. The work involves dredging a relatively small area lying between the existing 28-foot Federal project areas and the Duquesne marine terminal owned by the Erie Port Commission. The area would be dredged to 27 feet in soft material and 28 feet in hard material, to accommodate overseas general-cargo vessels.

The work would involve removal of about 33,000 cubic yards of earth and



39,500 cubic yards of rock. The latest estimate of cost of the Federal work is \$750,000, based on July 1963 price levels. The work would require two fiscal years: \$25,000 is needed in the first fiscal year to do detailed field surveys and complete preconstruction planning, and the remainder \$725,000 would be needed in the next fiscal year to do the dredging. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.1 to 1.0. The required assurances of local cooperation were furnished by the city of Erie and were approved on May 23, 1963. The port commission has already done necessary dockside dredging in connection with pier rehabilitation work.

Erie Harbor has established itself in the oversea general cargo trade via the St. Lawrence Seaway. The only general cargo dock at Erie is the Duquesne marine terminal. The present controlling depths in the dock approach area are not sufficient to allow vessels to use the terminal when loaded to the full draft permitted by the St. Lawrence Seaway connecting channels system. Deepening to the authorized 27-foot project depth would permit the efficient use of the harbor by the general cargo vessels utilizing this system. In common with other Great Lakes harbors, Erie is being adversely affected by prevailing low lake levels. Deepening of the dock approach area would help alleviate the effects at Erie.

The 1965 budget includes \$80,000 for routine operation and maintenance in Erie Harbor. This money is necessary for dredging at the channel entrance and to remove sediment that has accumulated in the harbor from streams and other sources.

#### SMALL HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

A total of \$35,000 is budgeted for planning for small harbors. The Buffalo office of the Corps of Engineers has proposed 25 possible sites within its jurisdiction for these harbors. Elk Creek in Erie County is one of the sites. Another is at North East in the same county.

These harbors will have an important function—serving as a refuge for boaters seeking safety from storms. Boaters, many of them unskilled, are increasing with great number. The harbors would serve as a convenience for them.

All of these projects will contribute to a better northwestern Pennsylvania whose lagging economy is in need of rejuvenation and stimulation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 11579, the public works appropriation bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I note with considerable satisfaction that the Appropriations Committee, in the bill before us, has deleted the \$1 million requested by the Bonneville Power Administration for planning on an extra-high-voltage transmission line into southern Idaho. The committee report directs Bonneville to spend no funds for any other purpose than for good faith negotiations for wheeling power into southern Idaho for preference customers only. Even this action is to be deplored, as there is no real justification or need for the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho.

A recent editorial in a southern Idaho newspaper headed, "Let's Invite BPA To Get Out—And Stay Out" aptly expresses the sentiment of the majority of the people of southern Idaho who strongly oppose the extension of the Bonneville Power Administration's market area into southern Idaho.

That this opposition is real and tremendous is vividly illustrated by the testimony presented to the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of this House when hearings were held on this matter. Here is a summary list of some of the various groups, representing tens of thousands of southern Idahoans, who testified or presented resolutions strongly opposing Bonneville's entry into their area.

The Idaho Farm Bureau, 28 local farm bureaus, 24 farm granges, 13 school groups—school boards, districts and PTA's, 4 county commissioner groups, 4 municipal governments, 53 members of the Idaho Legislature, Idaho tax commission, American Falls reservoir district, Idaho State Reclamation Association, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, 21 individual chambers of commerce, 9 junior chambers of commerce, Exchange Club, 5 Kiwanis Clubs, Snake River Valley Electrical Association, Boise, Sun Valley Business & Professional Women's Club, Idaho Association of Insurance Agents, Associated Industries of Idaho, businessmen of Shoshone, Idaho, and North Side Canal Co.

I am sure most of my colleagues will remember that I placed an extended series of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD earlier this year which pointed up the tremendous opposition in southern Idaho against the invasion by Bonneville. One Idahoan at that time suggested I use the following as a heading for my articles:

SOUTHERN IDAHO'S NEW SLOGAN—BONNEVILLE  
PLEASE INCLUDE US OUT

Now we find a southern Idaho editorial inviting Bonneville to "Get Out and Stay Out."

Earlier this year Bonneville, in taking over the marketing of power from Bureau of Reclamation powerplants in southern Idaho, entered into 20-year utility responsibility type contracts with the existing preference customers for electric power from the Bureau projects. I question the legal authority of Bonneville to take over this marketing of power from the Bureau of Reclamation plants and the authority to reduce by some 40 percent the previous Bureau rates for the power. This reduction is currently admittedly costing the taxpayers of the Nation some \$750,000 annually. With the same power, from the same plants, being delivered to the same customers, one of two things is true; either the preference customers were being gypped by an unwarranted high rate, or the taxpayers of the Nation are being gypped to furnish an unwarranted additional subsidy of \$750,000 annually. There is no question but that the latter is the case.

A reading of the Appropriations Committee hearings on the Bonneville con-

tract proposal to deliver below cost power to an industrial giant, now getting power from the existing private electric utilities in southern Idaho, discloses that rather than increase Bonneville's net revenue and provide for expanded employment in the area, it would have just the opposite effect.

I shall now summarize a number of the valid reasons for objecting to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho.

First. It would provide unfair competition to the existing electric utilities who are and have been providing the southern Idaho area with ample supplies of electric power at reasonable rates well under the national average. There is not now and never has been any shortage of power in this area to meet the growing load requirements of the area.

Second. The stockholders of the existing electric utilities in southern Idaho invested their funds in good faith and should not be subjected to unfair and unwarranted competition from tax-free Federal power at rates around one-half the actual cost of production and delivery of such Federal power.

Third. Proposed construction and operation of the transmission line and related facilities is totally uneconomic, and unwarranted under any realistic method of cost analysis. Bonneville admits cost of all Federal facilities needed to supply load contemplated would total over \$132 million. Interest cost alone at a realistic 4 percent would exceed revenue.

Fourth. The reliability of the proposed direct current line of 750,000 volts is very questionable. There is no line of such voltage and capacity operating any place in the world today. Bonneville's 1965 budget requested one-half million dollars to continue tests on high voltage direct current lines and related facilities.

Fifth. The major customer to be served by the proposed transmission line is the Monsanto Chemical Co., an industrial giant with total assets of around \$1.5 billion. This company reportedly is now the largest single producer of elemental phosphorus in the world. Monsanto's latest quarterly report shows that the company has achieved the highest quarterly sales and earnings in its history. Certainly, it is not in need of below-cost electric power subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers.

Sixth. The Bonneville contract with this industrial giant provides for sale of electric power at rates less than half the cost of production and delivery, at a time when Bonneville is operating with an annual loss averaging around \$15 million or more. Based on a proper interest rate of 4 percent, Bonneville now has a total deficit of well in excess of \$100 million instead of the claimed surplus of around \$20 million.

Seventh. Construction of this line and the transmission of Federal power thereon at the contemplated rates would amount to totally unwarranted subsidization of an industrial giant by the taxpayers of the Nation. It would give Monsanto Chemical Co., a sizable and totally unfair economic advantage over its competitors. Testimony at the hearings dis-



closes that this unfair advantage undoubtedly would force many competitors out of business. This would result in the loss of many times more jobs than the proposed expansion of Monsanto would provide.

Eighth. The contemplated invasion of southern Idaho by the Bonneville Power Administration and the proposed taxpayers' subsidization of an industrial giant now being served by the existing utilities in the area strikes at the very foundation of the economic system on which this Nation was founded and has grown great.

Ninth. Bonneville's proposed power rate to Monsanto is less than the equivalent tax rate per kilowatt-hour paid by the major private electric utilities of southern Idaho. This illustrates the inability of these private utilities to compete with tax-free Bonneville power.

Tenth. The Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho, contemplated by the construction of the proposed transmission lines into that area, would have very serious adverse effects on the local and State tax situation.

Eleventh. Delivery of Federal power to the preference customers in southern Idaho cannot justify the construction of the proposed transmission line, as those customers' loads are now being served by power generated at Bureau of Reclamation hydropower plants. The existing private taxpaying electric utilities of southern Idaho are now wheeling and delivering this power for Bonneville, just as they did for the Bureau of Reclamation before Bonneville took over the marketing. These private taxpaying utilities have presented written proposals to continue wheeling Federal power to meet all present and future load growth of these existing preference customers, and to take payment for such wheeling in electric energy from Bonneville. Consequently, these preference customers are assured of Federal power at Bonneville rates, without the need to spend a huge amount of taxpayers' funds to construct the proposed Bonneville transmission lines and related facilities. The electric energy to be delivered by Bonneville in payment for wheeling can, for the most part, be surplus hydroenergy that Bonneville cannot otherwise sell. This would result in a very low wheeling cost.

Twelfth. According to testimony presented at the hearings, construction of the proposed Bonneville transmission line into southern Idaho would result in reduction of future production of coal—to supply proposed increased steam electric power production—in an area of Wyoming that is just now trying to shed its poverty-stricken and disaster-area label. We cannot understand or support a proposal to affect adversely an area that is doing all it can to overcome its low economic plight, while at the same time the administration is championing a so-called fight-on-poverty program.

Thirteenth. Evidence presented at the hearings indicated quite clearly that the majority of people of southern Idaho did not and do not want Bonneville power in that area. Indicative of this is the editorial—May 14, 1964—I mentioned earlier, from a newspaper serving one of

the major cities of southern Idaho headed "Let's Invite BPA To Get Out and Stay Out."

The editorial follows:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer,  
May 14, 1964]

#### LET'S INVITE BPA TO GET OUT AND STAY OUT

The time has come to invite the Bonneville Power Administration to get out of southern Idaho—and stay out.

Nobody invited BPA into the Snake River Valley in the first place. Perfunctory preliminary steps were taken, it's true. But there was no organized, extensive effort to find out whether southern Idaho really wanted BPA to invade this territory. And we certainly heard no clamor for BPA, not even from the potential BPA customers.

But Interior Secretary Stewart Udall went ahead and did it anyway by official edict—a glaring example of bureaucratic power run wild. Conniving with him, apparently, were Senator FRANK CHURCH and Congressman RALPH HARDING. It was, we suppose, conceived as another of those grandiose "do good" gestures.

We viewed the whole proceeding at the time with grave concern, anticipating that southern Idaho was shortly to be embroiled in controversy and bickering which could last for years and far into the indefinite future. And that's exactly what is happening.

We were getting along all right in southern Idaho before BPA invaded the Snake River Valley. For years, what public power we had had been administered by the Bureau of Reclamation. It was closely identified with Idaho's water resource development, certainly Idaho's No. 1 responsibility and economic opportunity.

During all of those years, Snake River Valley residents have worked in harmony with the Bureau of Reclamation. We met our obligations; we didn't depend on anybody outside our area; we pursued the orderly development of rivers, streams, and arid lands. We used the power byproduct to help defray those project costs.

Then BPA came—and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation relinquished its power operations to the invader. It is significant that, over the long years of Idaho's water resource development, with the cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation, southern Idaho was singularly free of serious controversy or conflict. We knew where we were trying to go; we got along. It wasn't until Burns Creek hit the Bureau of Reclamation's construction calendar that we ran into opposition—and that, we think practically everyone will agree, was the match that set the BPA conflagration.

Where are we today? Exactly where we used to be so far as resource development is concerned. And the prospect for the future is far from bright.

BPA today has already signed up every eligible customer in the Snake River Valley. It is handling identically the same power that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation formerly administered. BPA has a central office in Idaho Falls, a manager and personnel. That personnel is superimposed on what we already had; another fine example of growing bureaucracy and paternalism with higher and higher salary outlays.

Nor is that all. Only three municipalities of any consequence in all of the Snake River Valley qualified for BPA contracts because they either operated powerplants or municipal distribution systems. Those favored three: Idaho Falls, Burley, and Rupert.

We don't know what happened in Burley and Rupert. But Idaho Falls was handed a plum totaling about \$120,000 per annum along with its BPA contract. That's an outright gift which somebody, somewhere, has to pay inasmuch as BPA currently is operating in the red at the rate of almost \$20 million per year.

If there is another important Idaho city which, now or ever, can qualify for such a power contract, we don't know that city. And we submit that there is sound reason for other cities to scream to high heaven about all this; they are being discriminated against, penalized by BPA's rate structure which today has no sound economic background. It isn't fair, it isn't right, it isn't even honest.

And then came that preposterous proposal to provide power to Monsanto Chemical Co. at Soda Springs for 2.2 mills.

The arguments on that one have been pretty well aired; how we've already lost a \$4 or \$5 million wet process plant addition in Pocatello; how it may cost Idaho the final big generating plant on Snake River below Weiser.

If 2.2 mills is a favorable industrial rate, how can BPA justify the much higher municipal rates charged such major users as the city of Idaho Falls?

And how, if what we've been paying for Federal power to liquidate obligations under Bureau of Reclamation projects repayment contracts are right, can we hope to devise an acceptable feasibility report for such projects as Burns Creek and the Fremont Dam?

Or are we in Idaho to be classed as one of the Nation's underprivileged, poverty stricken regions to be perpetually subsidized by tax-grabbing Uncle Sam, dedicated to the proposition that he can take money—millions of dollars—away from somebody else to give to us?

We don't like any of this. We wish that there were some way to get rid of BPA now and forever.

Also indicative of the thinking of southern Idahoans is the editorial from another Idaho newspaper entitled "We're Not That Hungry in Idaho."

This editorial follows:

[From the Independent Enterprise, May 14, 1964]

#### WE'RE NOT THAT HUNGRY IN IDAHO

Now comes a new problem in the Bonneville Power squabble over the \$73 million transmission lines into southern Idaho. Backers of the BPA plan right now are telling special committees in both the House and Senate at Washington how much good it would do the phosphate industry in Idaho and how many jobs it would create.

They are basing their arguments on a joint report of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation that "capacity of phosphorus operations in southern Idaho could be expected to quadruple," and that "lower costs for power hold the key to the future of the phosphate industry in the State."

That same treatment—word for word—was used Thursday by the Stauffer Chemical Co. of New York City in saying that if the Federal Government follows through on its plan to extend Bonneville power into Idaho, in all probability, the company would be forced to close its \$15 million plant in Butte and put some 250 employees on the jobless rolls.

This comes on the heels of the statement by the J. R. Simplot Co. that it will have to abandon planned expansion at their big Pocatello plant which would eliminate another large parcel of new jobs for Idaho.

The Stauffer Co., we think, takes a very sensible and reasonable view to the situation. The company, a producer of phosphorous in Montana, Tennessee, and Florida, and phosphate products in six other States, contends it is "not an enemy of public power."

The company based its opposition partly on what it termed a "basic change in Federal power marketing policy." Direct sale of Federal power to industrial users, it pointed out, has previously been limited to industries which cannot reasonably be served by non-



Federal utilities. The Idaho phosphate industry, the company contends, already has access to an adequate supply of electric power at low rates.

And while the argument goes on in Washington, this Stauffer action brings up a very pertinent question right here in Idaho.

How badly does Idaho want to become the leader of the phosphate industry? Putting aside all other arguments on the rightness or the wrongness of the situation or the contentions of public versus private power, does Idaho really want to make gains of any kind in the industrial field at the expense of a sister State and, probably, other States in the country?

For instance, how could Idaho possibly point to any rise in our own employment due to the expanded phosphate operations here when we knew that we kicked 250 breadwinners and heads of families out of a livelihood in Butte, Mont.? Or in Florida or in Colorado or anyplace else?

Are we that hungry?

And just what kind of a reputation would Idaho have—even before the ink on the Bonneville contract was dry? What would businessmen think who are considering Idaho as a site for their factories or industries? What would organized labor think? What would anybody with a spark of fair-play and the least bit of feeling for his fellow man's well-being think?

Personally, we don't want folks thinking things like that about us. And when Senator CHURCH says in Washington that "he and Representative HARDING are expressing the views of the people of Idaho in supporting the proposal," we think that Senator CHURCH is a long way from telling the truth.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H.R. 11579 and express approval of the action of the Appropriations Committee with respect to the projects designated in West Virginia.

On March 5, 1964, I requested the Public Works Committee of the House to approve a resolution of mine to authorize a study of the Middle Island Creek Basin, and I was pleased to receive on May 8, 1964, a letter from the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, in which he stated:

I am delighted to advise you that our full Committee on Public Works this morning approved your resolution providing for a study of the Middle Island Creek Basin.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, after some conversation concerning this flood control project with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I was pleased to find that the Committee on Appropriations had included \$20,000 for the Middle Island Creek Basin study, even though the same was an unbudgeted item for this year.

With respect to the other projects in West Virginia for which sums are to be appropriated, I express my thanks to the gentleman from Ohio and to the other members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, industry and commerce have responded exceedingly well to the intracoastal waterways system and its connecting portions, such as our navigable rivers. The improvement of these projects to our waterways brings industry to areas and affords them the use of one of the most inexpensive means of transporting products and raw materials. Thinking of the service to our people, to commerce, and to industry, it is exceedingly pleasing to

me to find that the Committee on Appropriations has favorably considered some waterway projects for which I have particular interest.

There is much to be done to complete the job in order that an integrated system of waterways will provide a most efficient operation. I am very glad to see that H.R. 11579 appropriates the requested \$80,000 for the fiscal year 1965 to continue the study of a missing link in the intracoastal waterways; namely, from the St. Marks River to the Tampa Bay. This gap is a part of the portion of the coastline of the eastern United States which prevents there being a protected inland waterway from Trenton, N.J., to the Mexican border, a distance of nearly 3,000 miles. The committee's appropriation is a great step forward in our efforts toward a finer and more complete waterway system. I am sure the study will mean a great deal and will point out the need for authorized construction.

Another portion of this gap which is now being considered extends from the St. Marks River to Carrabelle, Fla., and is a 28-mile section of the waterways system. It seems most logical that a survey of this portion of the waterways system should be made effective in order that it will form a consistent program of operations toward the completion of the entire intracoastal waterways. The Corps of Engineers needs \$20,000 to begin and conduct this study. However, I regret that favorable consideration was not given this request. It is hoped that in the near future its importance will be realized and it will be seen fit to allow funds

Our rivers play a most important role in the waterways system in this country, and the Apalachicola River in my district plays a fine and excellent role in contributing to commerce of our area. The river has had an amazing growth in the traffic of fuel oils, chemicals, and bulky raw materials; and there is a prospective annual commerce estimated at 2,500,000 tons. The work which has already been done on this river has justified the need for further channel improvement, and I am most happy that the needed appropriation of \$100,000 has been made.

Every effort that contributes toward the completion of our entire intracoastal waterways is needed and desired, and I feel these projects are significant in this respect.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, today the House is scheduled to act on a \$4 billion public works appropriation bill. Some opposing Members prefer to call this the pork barrel bill, but in my part of the country the necessity for water resource development would make it more accurately termed the "bread and butter" bill. The reclamation, power producing, navigational, and flood control projects constructed by the Federal Government have been and continue to be tremendous stimuli in the economic development of the West. I wholeheartedly support H.R. 11579. My only wish is that more funds were available for these projects. In particular I had hoped that final design and initial construction funds had been recommended for the Lower Granite Lock and Dam in the State of Washington.

Lower Granite was authorized over 15 years ago and its total cost will be \$174 million. To date over \$2 million have been appropriated for design work and some test drilling has been accomplished. According to construction schedules, \$1,600,000 should be made available for fiscal 1965 work. I firmly believe that a delay in funds this year would be a mistake and a prime example of false economy. The estimated cost of the project of this magnitude increased over \$5 million per year. Every year of procrastination will ultimately cost the taxpayer more than the \$5 million because of the very favorable cost-benefit ratio for Lower Granite. Viewed from this aspect, every year's delay costs us nearly \$10 million. Compare \$1,600,000 to \$10 million and you readily see what I mean by false economy.

Although Lower Granite is located in the State of Washington, I have a very keen interest in this multiple purpose project. Lower Granite is the last link in the series of locks and dams which will provide slack water navigation to Lewiston, Idaho. Its completion will put 2,328,000 tons of products into the streams of commerce through navigation down the Snake and Columbia Rivers. Slack-water navigation to the inland State of Idaho was considered a vague, vague possibility. Completion of Lower Granite will make this a reality. The prospect of water transportation to the west coast stirs even the most pessimistic souls in Idaho, because our greatest economic barrier is the high cost of land transportation of our products to the large markets. The rich resources of our State and neighboring inland areas will be allowed to enrich the Nation if we are given the opportunity to use our waterways for their transport.

Navigation is not the only, nor even the greatest benefit of the Lower Granite Lock and Dam. It is truly a multiple purpose project; the greatest of which is the generation of electricity which will help energize not only the Northwest but the whole of the west coast. The negotiation for the interchanges of electrical power between the Northwest and the Southwest will be given 500-kilowatt impetus through completion of Lower Granite. Our growing population and industry will demand this energy and more by the time this dam is completed. I sincerely and hopefully ask that the Members of the 88th Congress will be remembered for their true economy and foresightedness in keeping Lower Granite on schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY  
CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such



corporation, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: Page 9, line 5. After the word "use", change the period to a colon and add:

"Provided, That no real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized on the point of order.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to speak to the point of order.

This language was originally inserted in the public works appropriation bill for 1964—it is the same language exactly—by one of the most distinguished parliamentarians ever to serve in the Congress of the United States, the late Clarence Cannon of Missouri, the dean of my delegation and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and, by all odds, the best expert one could consult on the proper language to insert in this appropriation bill to serve a high patriotic purpose. This is the 1963-64 Cannon-Sullivan amendment to last year's bill.

This amendment does not prevent the Panama Canal Company from carrying out its legal responsibilities under the Government Corporation Control Act, and I shall document that.

Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act—31 U.S.C. 849—which is the legislative provision under which this particular appropriation item appears in the bill, and which deals with the powers of Congress in reviewing the activities of Government corporations and their budgets, states, and I quote:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for the repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends.

There is, of course, more to the section, including several provisos that it shall not prevent the corporations from carrying out existing law or existing authority to make contracts, and so forth, but, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in present law to authorize the Panama Canal Company to breach the treaty with Panama, or to surrender sovereignty within the Canal Zone, or to give away facilities for operation by foreign nationals within the zone.

Furthermore, the language I have cited provides specifically for congressional limitation of the use of corporate funds or other financial resources which involve, among other things, the ability of the corporation to repay capital funds and to pay dividends. If the Panama Canal Company gives away, or leases below value or cost, or otherwise dissipates its investment in the piers, dairy, commissaries, and other installations, its ability to repay capital funds will be diminished and the dividends it would otherwise pay to the Treasury would be destroyed. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the point of order be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair is prepared to rule. From the reading of the amendment, the Chair feels that the language is purely legislation. It has no bearing upon the appropriation and falls within the prohibition of legislating on an appropriation bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am looking at page 1098 of the hearings and I would like to ask a question of someone. I believe the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] did the questioning at this point in the hearing record. Do I understand that this Government is putting some \$84.4 million into Panama? Is this going to the Panamanian Government, when they have a budget for their own support of only some \$80 million? In other words, are we putting more money into the Panamanian Government and within reach of the Panamanian Government than they are putting up in terms of their own budget? Is that correct, will the gentleman state for the RECORD?

Mr. KIRWAN. If the gentleman will yield, yes, the amount is \$84 million. It consists of the amount of \$1.9 million, \$36 million in salaries and the balance is for purchases made in the Panamanian economy as a result of the canal operation.

Mr. GROSS. We are putting \$4 million more into the Panamanian Government than they collect from their people in taxes with which to sustain their own Government?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; but that is to be expected for the canal is the main source of income and expenditure in the area. Annual cost of operation of the canal is about \$100 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am just trying to get some facts straight, that this Government, the foreign giveaway outfit, the foreign aid outfit, call it whatever you want, is putting \$3 million in so-called economic aid into Panama to sugarcoat the tolls situation, to give that Government more money rather than increased receipts from tolls from the canal. In other words, this Government is apparently giving them a sop of \$3 million and calling it foreign aid to make up for the difference the Panamanians think we

ought to give them in tolls collected on the Panama Canal. Can this be correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not have anything to do with the \$3 million. It is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not have an answer to the question. Is the foreign aid outfit giving them \$3 million as a differential between what they get and what they think they ought to have?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know myself. That matter is contained in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. When did we last raise the tolls for the Panama Canal?

Mr. KIRWAN. There has never been a change in tolls on the Panama Canal since 1914. There was one change in method of measurement for assessing.

Mr. GROSS. But we take out of so-called foreign aid—that is why I call it a giveaway—take \$3 million from foreign aid in lieu of a larger apportionment of the tolls from the canal?

Mr. KIRWAN. The canal pays for itself. That is No. 1. We are putting money down there in this appropriation bill for canal and Canal Zone operations only. We have nothing to do with foreign aid.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I believe he will find that the canal lacks \$500 million being paid for, and that money is owed to American taxpayers.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about covering the operating expenses and capital improvements.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. KIRWAN. This committee only takes care of the annual operating expenses. We are putting no other money in there. This committee is not responsible for that.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but there are some facets of this that I hope the committee will go into before the next appropriations bill comes up. I believe the committee ought to know why the tolls have not been increased.

Mr. KIRWAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I say to the gentleman that that is a fair request and if I am around next year, we shall go into it.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to answer the gentleman's question in this way. The reason I was very hopeful of getting the previous language which I offered in this bill is because the Panama Canal Company feels that it has the right under its present authority to lease or give away any of the facilities that are within the Canal Zone. These facilities at the present time hire and use some 5,000 Panamanian workers, not U.S. workers. These workers are paid on the wage scale prevalent in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentlewoman will find that that figure is 7,000-plus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)



Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The figures I received last month were direct from the Panama Canal Company. These facilities I mentioned before, including the piers, are the most important at the present time. They are very desirous of leasing these piers which handle all of the cargo coming into Panama Canal except cargo that comes in on Panama ships. They want to turn that over to a Panamanian operator who, if they get permission to do this, will throw these Panamanian workers out of work and hire their own help from Panama, but at a rate of somewhere between 25 to 40 cent an hour. At the present time these Panamanians are making under the U.S. wage scale from 95 cents to \$2.95 an hour.

This is one of the reasons I wanted to prevent this thing from happening, because if they do lease these piers or any of the facilities it is going to do more to hurt the Panamanian people through helping one or two of the oligarchy who get all of the returns.

Mr. GROSS. I would have been most happy to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri, and I hope it can be attached to some bill to which it will be germane.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made to the bill? [After pause.] Are there any further amendments? [No response.]

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Boggs, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 11, answered "present" 2, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—360

|                |               |                 |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abbott         | Dague         | Hawkins         |
| Abele          | Daniels       | Hays            |
| Abernethy      | Davis, Ga.    | Healey          |
| Adair          | Davis, Tenn.  | Hébert          |
| Addabbo        | Dawson        | Hechler         |
| Albert         | Delaney       | Henderson       |
| Anderson       | Dent          | Herlong         |
| Andrews, Ala.  | Denton        | Hoeven          |
| Andrews,       | Derounian     | Hollifield      |
| N. Dak.        | Derwinski     | Holland         |
| Arends         | Diggs         | Horan           |
| Ashbrook       | Dole          | Horton          |
| Ashmore        | Donohue       | Huddleston      |
| Aspinall       | Dorn          | Hull            |
| Auchincloss    | Downing       | Ichord          |
| Ayres          | Dulski        | Jarman          |
| Baker          | Duncan        | Jennings        |
| Baldwin        | Dwyer         | Jensen          |
| Baring         | Edmondson     | Johnson, Calif. |
| Barrett        | Edwards       | Johnson, Pa.    |
| Bates          | Elliott       | Johnson, Wis.   |
| Battin         | Everett       | Jonas           |
| Becker         | Evens         | Jones, Ala.     |
| Beckworth      | Fallon        | Jones, Mo.      |
| Beermann       | Farbstein     | Karsten         |
| Belcher        | Fascell       | Karth           |
| Bell           | Feighan       | Kastenmeier     |
| Bennett, Fla.  | Findley       | Keith           |
| Berry          | Finnegan      | Kelly           |
| Betts          | Fino          | Keogh           |
| Boggs          | Fisher        | Kilburn         |
| Boland         | Flood         | Kilgore         |
| Bolton,        | Flynt         | King, Calif.    |
| Frances P.     | Fogarty       | Kirwan          |
| Bolton,        | Fountain      | Kluczynski      |
| Oliver P.      | Fraser        | Knox            |
| Bonner         | Frelinghuysen | Kornegay        |
| Bow            | Friedel       | Kunkel          |
| Brademas       | Fulton, Pa.   | Kyl             |
| Bray           | Fulton, Tenn. | Landrum         |
| Brock          | Fuqua         | Langen          |
| Bromwell       | Gallagher     | Lennon          |
| Brooks         | Garmatz       | Lesinski        |
| Brotzman       | Gary          | Libonati        |
| Brown, Calif.  | Gathings      | Lindsay         |
| Brown, Ohio    | Gialmo        | Long, La.       |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Gibbons       | Long, Md.       |
| Broyhill, Va.  | Gilbert       | McClory         |
| Burke          | Gill          | McCulloch       |
| Burkhalter     | Glenn         | McDowell        |
| Burton, Calif. | Gonzalez      | McFall          |
| Burton, Utah   | Goodling      | McIntire        |
| Byrne, Pa.     | Grabowski     | McLoskey        |
| Byrnes, Wis.   | Grant         | McMillan        |
| Cahill         | Gray          | Macdonald       |
| Cameron        | Green, Oreg.  | Madden          |
| Carey          | Green, Pa.    | Mahon           |
| Casey          | Griffin       | Mailliard       |
| Cederberg      | Griffiths     | Marsh           |
| Celler         | Gross         | Martin, Calif.  |
| Chamberlain    | Grover        | Martin, Mass.   |
| Chelf          | Gurney        | Martin, Nebr.   |
| Chenoweth      | Hagan, Ga.    | Mathias         |
| Clark          | Hagen, Calif. | Matsunaga       |
| Clausen,       | Haley         | Matthews        |
| Don H.         | Hall          | May             |
| Cleveland      | Halleck       | Meader          |
| Cohelan        | Halpern       | Michel          |
| Collier        | Hanna         | Miller, Calif.  |
| Conte          | Hansen        | Milliken        |
| Cooley         | Harding       | Mills           |
| Corbett        | Hardy         | Minish          |
| Cramer         | Harris        | Minshall        |
| Cunningham     | Harrison      | Montoya         |
| Curtin         | Harsha        | Moore           |
| Curtis         | Harvey, Ind.  | Moorhead        |
| Daddario       | Harvey, Mich. | Morgan          |

|               |                |                |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Morris        | Rivers, Alaska | Steed          |
| Morrison      | Rivers, S.C.   | Stephens       |
| Morse         | Roberts, Ala.  | Stinson        |
| Mosher        | Roberts, Tex.  | Stratton       |
| Moss          | Robison        | Stubblefield   |
| Multer        | Rodino         | Sullivan       |
| Murphy, Ill.  | Rogers, Colo.  | Taft           |
| Murphy, N.Y.  | Rogers, Fla.   | Talcott        |
| Murray        | Rogers, Tex.   | Teague, Calif. |
| Natcher       | Rooney, N.Y.   | Teague, Tex.   |
| Nedzi         | Rooney, Pa.    | Thomas         |
| Nelsen        | Roosevelt      | Thompson, La.  |
| Nix           | Rosenthal      | Thompson, N.J. |
| Norblad       | Rostenkowski   | Thompson, Tex. |
| O'Brien, N.Y. | Roudebush      | Thomson, Wis.  |
| O'Hara, Ill.  | Roush          | Tollefson      |
| O'Hara, Mich. | Roybal         | Trimble        |
| O'Konski      | Rumsfeld       | Tuck           |
| Olsen, Mont.  | Ryan, Mich.    | Tuten          |
| Olson, Minn.  | Ryan, N.Y.     | Ullman         |
| O'Neill       | St. George     | Van Deerlin    |
| Ostertag      | St. Germain    | Vanik          |
| Patman        | St. Onge       | Van Pelt       |
| Patten        | Saylor         | Vinson         |
| Pelly         | Schadeberg     | Watson         |
| Pepper        | Schenck        | Watts          |
| Perkins       | Schneebeli     | Weaver         |
| Philbin       | Schweiker      | Weitner        |
| Pickle        | Schwengel      | Whalley        |
| Pike          | Secrest        | Wharton        |
| Pillion       | Selden         | White          |
| Pirnie        | Shipley        | Whitener       |
| Poage         | Short          | Wickersham     |
| Poff          | Shriver        | Widnall        |
| Price         | Sibal          | Williams       |
| Pucinski      | Sickles        | Willis         |
| Purcell       | Sikes          | Willson,       |
| Quillen       | Siler          | Charles H.     |
| Randall       | Sisk           | Wilson, Ind.   |
| Reid, N.Y.    | Skubitz        | Winstead       |
| Reuss         | Slack          | Wylder         |
| Rhodes, Ariz. | Smith, Iowa    | Wyman          |
| Rhodes, Pa.   | Smith, Va.     | Young          |
| Rich          | Staebler       | Younger        |
| Riehlman      | Stafford       | Zablocki       |

NAYS—11

|            |            |               |
|------------|------------|---------------|
| Broomfield | Hutchinson | MacGregor     |
| Bruce      | Johansen   | Reid, Ill.    |
| Clancy     | King, N.Y. | Smith, Calif. |
| Devine     | Latta      |               |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| Snyder | Utt |
|--------|-----|

NOT VOTING—58

|                |              |             |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Alger          | Goodell      | Powell      |
| Ashley         | Gubser       | Quie        |
| Avery          | Hoffman      | Rains       |
| Barry          | Hosmer       | Reifel      |
| Bass           | Joelson      | Scott       |
| Bennett, Mich. | Kee          | Senner      |
| Blatnik        | Laird        | Sheppard    |
| Bolling        | Lankford     | Springer    |
| Buckley        | Leggett      | Staggers    |
| Burleson       | Lipscomb     | Taylor      |
| Clawson, Del.  | Lloyd        | Toll        |
| Colmer         | McDade       | Tupper      |
| Corman         | Miller, N.Y. | Udall       |
| Dingell        | Monagan      | Waggoner    |
| Dowdy          | Morton       | Wallhauser  |
| Ellsworth      | Osmer        | Westland    |
| Ford           | Passman      | Whitten     |
| Foreman        | Pilcher      | Wilson, Bob |
| Forrester      | Pool         | Wright      |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Alger against.  
Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Snyder against.  
Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Laird against.  
Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Avery.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ford.  
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Barry.  
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Osmer.  
Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hosmer.  
Mr. Rains with Mr. Springer.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Lipscomb.



Mr. Udall with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Scott with Mr. Foreman.  
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Goodell.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Quie.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wallhauser.  
Mr. Toll with Mr. McDade.  
Mr. Pool with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mrs. Kee.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Lankford.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bass.  
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Passman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL]. If he were present he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. Were he here he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### CONSIDERATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 744 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9876) to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for two additional years and providing for a special project and study. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

[Mr. ELLIOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from

Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], House Resolution 744 provides for an open rule and for 2 hours of consideration for the extension and the amendment of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt but what every Member of this House of Representatives would be ready, able, and willing to appropriate much, much more money than is called for in this bill if we knew we could materially reduce juvenile delinquency.

When I handled this particular rule at the time the bill was originally brought to the floor on August 30, 1961, I asked what the program would call for and what the plans were. If my memory serves me correctly I was unable to ascertain any particular information as to what the plan or program called for.

At that time I suggested that we have a pilot program in the District of Columbia where we have jurisdiction. It was felt apparently we should not do that at that time. But now this bill 2 years or almost 3 years later will set up and call for the first time for a pilot program for a 2-year study in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could do something to stop juvenile delinquency. Actually it has increased more during the past 2½ years. In making inquiry as to what has happened to the \$18 or \$20 million that was authorized, and almost that much has been expended, the answer is it has been too early to tell what the accomplishments of this particular program are, so it needs to be extended for another period of time in order to carry out the complete program.

If you read the report you will find that a number of grants have been made to various colleges, you will find a number of grants have been made to various colleges to teach individuals and teachers the problems of juvenile delinquency; but, as a law enforcement officer I cannot help but say it seems to me we are spending money to get a nice report in the way of information instead of reaching right down at the core of the problem. I feel very sincerely and strongly that we are sparing too many rods and spoiling too many children.

There is too much juvenile delinquency. It might be a good idea to study parental delinquency. There are too many parents who do not take care of their children, who do not know where they are. We have many, many people who criticize the law enforcement officer who is trying to protect their life and property 24 hours a day. But when he makes a mistake people criticize him, and so on down the line. I just cannot help feeling that some place along the line we should get down to the people who really know about juvenile delinquency. They can make some suggestions as to what we should do. I noticed from the mail I have received that time after time an individual 21 or 22 years of age who has worked and labored hard to obtain a college education and wants to go on to become a doctor or lawyer is then drafted. Why do we not take some of these juvenile delinquents who are not desirous of going through school and who

are dropouts and draft them into the Army and make men out of them? The answer seems to be that the Army does not want that type of individual. They want the most intelligent person rather than having to face the problem of juvenile delinquents.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this rule. I am 100 percent for fighting juvenile delinquency, and I will do anything I can to help. If we could get some of these experts who know the problem and who have studied it I believe they can make many, many suggestions that will help to some extent to cut down juvenile delinquency. Merely spending \$30 million is not going to do it, and if I am here 2 years from now I will make this same inquiry, and I am willing to prognosticate that we will have accomplished very little with the \$30 million. We will make some more grants and maybe have a nice report that will gather dust down here in the basement of the Capitol.

I am for attacking this problem of juvenile delinquency to the fullest extent. But I am not very happy with the approach we are making to it at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9876) to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9876, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair as Chairman pro tempore.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Alabama suggested when he was discussing the rule, this House in 1961 passed legislation designed "to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to the solution of the national juvenile delinquency control problems." The original legislation provided \$10 million for each of 3 years. This legislation expires on June 30, 1964; in other words, about 2 weeks from now, if we do not extend it today.

May I say to the House that of the \$30 million which was authorized in 1961 for the 3-year period only about \$19 million has actually been appropriated.

In presenting the original legislation for control and prevention of juvenile delinquency, there was no proponent of



the bill who suggested for one moment that the major responsibility resided in the Federal Government. Indeed, the very modest request indicated that no Federal program could possibly supplant the multitude of independent efforts which must go into any successful attack on juvenile delinquency.

However, in 1961, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], who had been the chairman of the subcommittee that originally had jurisdiction over this legislation, said to the House that the time has come to provide resources to pursue some experimentation on techniques and practices of controlling juvenile delinquency and to encourage and aid States, communities, and nonprofit organizations to conduct demonstration and evaluation projects with a view toward developing new techniques and practices.

I listened also to the gentleman from California, who is a member of the Rules Committee, a few moments ago. May I say that none of us on the committee who are the proponents of this legislation, believed that the \$30 million that was authorized or the \$19 million that was appropriated would solve the juvenile delinquency problems. We only hoped when we offered the original legislation that first, we would perhaps have a better understanding of the juvenile delinquent and the causes of juvenile delinquency; secondly, that we would have additional trained personnel who would be working with the juvenile delinquents or the potential delinquents; thirdly, that we would have new techniques or demonstration projects which would show what might be done or indeed what should be done to prevent more juvenile delinquency; and lastly, that the Federal program would stimulate the local governments to provide better programs in this area.

We did not propose in 1961 that money would be spent in accumulating additional studies to gather dust on library shelves. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], in the debate in 1961, appropriately pointed out that he had in his office 47 different studies which the Federal Government had made on juvenile delinquency and that the Library of Congress bibliography listed 480 major contributions on the subject.

But those of us on the committee who were recommending the legislation did hope that leadership would be given at the Federal level to this ever-increasing problem confronting the country.

There is no State, there is no city, there is no community, there is no rural area that is immune to the problems presented by the uneducated, the unemployed and by the unemployable young men and young women who comprise the million dropouts from our schools.

The statistics show that unemployment in this country is about three times as high among the 16 to 21 year olds as it is among the rest of the population.

The Labor Department reports that the number of persons entering the labor market in 1964 is approximately 2.6 million people and that of those, there will be 1.8 million young people between the ages of 16 and 21. Roughly one-third

of those 1,800,000 seeking employment do not have high school diplomas.

Now I would say to my colleagues that it just does not seem sufficient to cry out in alarm over these startling statistics, and it is not sufficient just to demand more severe punishment for the offenders. We must do our best to seek methods of preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency and hopefully to try to find constructive solutions to the problems.

In the last few years under this legislation, planning grants have been made to 16 cities or 17, if we count the HAR-YOU and the ACT programs in New York City as two separate programs.

Action grants have been given in 13 cities.

In a letter from the director of the juvenile delinquency program dated yesterday, June 15, he said:

We plan in fiscal 1965 to maintain not more than eight and possibly less, of the comprehensive projects that we have started. In addition, we plan to spend \$1,800,000 for a number of limited demonstration projects focusing directly on delinquency in communities other than the present project cities.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, during the last few years grants have been made to six training centers for programs to train needed personnel.

Eleven grants have been made for curriculum development, and nine grants have been made for short-term workshop and institute training programs.

The legislation we bring before you today would extend the program for 2 years only. At the appropriate time I am going to offer an amendment which will limit the authorization of appropriations for 1 year only so that the committee will have the opportunity of reevaluating the program and the direction that is being followed.

In addition to the extension of the program for 2 years beyond June, 1964, the bill provides for a special study of school attendance and child labor laws with a view to determining the effect of such laws on juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. In 1961 the committee was very hopeful that those who were administering the program would carry on this kind of study. This year we have written the language so that such a study is mandatory.

In 1961 the committee was also most anxious that particular attention be given to the juvenile delinquency problems in the Washington metropolitan area, as a member of the Committee on Rules suggested a moment ago, because, clearly, the District of Columbia is a Federal responsibility.

The most recent figures we have from the Deputy Chief of Police in the District of Columbia indicate that the incidence of juvenile delinquency in the District is at an alltime high and has been that way for the last 10 months.

There is an average of 480 criminal and quasi-criminal juvenile offenses each month which are referred to the juvenile court. In fiscal years 1957 and 1958 there were only 240 to 250 such offenses per month referred to the juvenile court.

On July 1, 1962, the first grant was made to the District of Columbia, for the program known as WAY. Some of us believe that not enough attention has been given to this particular area. On that basis a new section was added to the bill now before us to provide a special project in the Washington metropolitan area.

We expect that there will be provided additional guidance and counseling personnel and services to supplement those already provided.

We expect that there will be the establishment and operation of halfway houses—residential centers for the delinquents—those who have already been incarcerated in institutions or those who have been referred by the courts.

We hope that from this special project greater job opportunities will be created for youth in the Washington area.

In addition, we expect there will be an increase in the number of roving leaders to work with delinquents and potential delinquents.

We also expect that there will be a maximum utilization of school facilities and recreation services, that there will be additional remedial reading classes to help prevent school dropouts, and that there will be special work training programs established.

The legislation, for this particular project, provides an additional authorization of \$5 million.

Mr. Chairman, it would be most unfortunate, I believe, to assume from the comments I have made that a majority or even a large percentage of American young people are juvenile delinquents. Quite the contrary is true. Most experts agree that between 95 and 97 percent of our young people never come to the attention of police officers or of the courts because they are responsible young Americans. The youthful offenders are limited to approximately 3 or 4 percent.

Nevertheless the number of crimes and the number of police arrests are alarming.

We are told that each youth who embraces a career of crime, or travels the pathway of delinquency, costs society \$85,000 during his lifetime. If, by passage of this legislation, we are able to save 200 youngsters—to prevent 200 youngsters from following a life of crime—we will have paid for the cost of the entire bill. It should also be noted that the reported cost of confining a young person in a Federal institution is approximately \$3,500 a year.

Mr. Chairman, we will either help our delinquents, or potential delinquents, to become useful and productive members of society, or they may become destructive and dependent. This legislation may or may not accomplish what we hope and expect, but it is an absolute certainty that if we do not make the effort the alternative will cost a great deal more.

I urge that the legislation be adopted.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compli-







88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 17 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

- 1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2   *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3   That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money

1 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal  
2 year ending June 30, 1965, for certain civil functions admin-  
3 istered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal,  
4 certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the  
5 Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway  
6 Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority,  
7 and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for other  
8 purposes, namely:

9 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

10 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

11 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by  
14 law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of  
15 national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers  
16 for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor  
17 vehicles; maintenance of that portion of Congressional  
18 Cemetery to which the United States has title, Con-  
19 federate burial places under the jurisdiction of the De-  
20 partment of the Army, and graves used by the  
21 Army in commercial cemeteries; \$13,295,000: *Pro-*  
22 *vided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair  
23 more than a single approach road to any national cemetery:  
24 *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obli-  
25 gated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family  
26 quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such

1 limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as  
2 may be required to provide office space, public comfort  
3 rooms, or space for the storage of Government property  
4 within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimburse-  
5 ment shall be made to the applicable military appropriation  
6 for the pay and allowances of any military personnel per-  
7 forming services primarily for the purposes of this appro-  
8 priation.

9 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

10 The following appropriations shall be expended under  
11 the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the super-  
12 vision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions  
13 of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and har-  
14 bors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

15 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

16 For expenses necessary for the collection and study of  
17 basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood con-  
18 trol, shore protection, and related projects, and when author-  
19 ized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authoriza-  
20 tion for construction, \$20,590,000, to remain available until  
21 expended: *Provided*, That \$210,000 of this appropriation  
22 shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife  
23 Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as  
24 required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958  
25 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation



1 shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with  
2 other features of water-resource development programs of  
3 the Department of the Army.

4 CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

5 For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control,  
6 shore protection, and related projects authorized by law;  
7 and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects  
8 (including those for development with participation or under  
9 consideration for participation by States, local governments,  
10 or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection  
11 by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment  
12 of the Government to construction) ; \$905,767,200, to re-  
13 main available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of  
14 this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by  
15 law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to  
16 be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits  
17 of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appro-  
18 priated: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 of this appropria-  
19 tion shall be transferred to the United States Fish and  
20 Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports  
21 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
22 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife  
23 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
24 nated with other features of water-resource development  
25 programs of the Department of the Army.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation; \$158,676,000, to remain available until expended.

## FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION

## EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 8, 1941, as amended, \$4,150,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with this appropriation.

## GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal Engineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; \$15,575,000.

## FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

9 For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood  
10 control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance  
11 of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as  
12 authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$73,550,000,  
13 to remain available until expended.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for ex-  
penses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in  
the manner authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of  
July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances there-  
for, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as  
amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during  
a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports author-  
ized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed  
during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustra-  
tions, as documents of the next succeeding session of Con-



gress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and sixty-seven for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

## THE PANAMA CANAL

### CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) ; contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; maintaining and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and payments of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, \$29,088,000.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

1  
2 For acquisition of land and land under water and acqui-  
3 sition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities,  
4 structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code,  
5 Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of  
6 not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles of which  
7 nine are for replacement only, and of which twelve are for  
8 police-type use without regard to the general purchase price  
9 limitation for the current fiscal year; improving facilities of  
10 other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal  
11 Zone Government use; and expenses incident to the retire-  
12 ment of such assets; \$4,821,000, to remain available until  
13 expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation  
14 under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation  
15 Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used  
16 for expenses related to the construction of quarters of non-  
17 U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding \$16,500.

## PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

## CORPORATION

18  
19  
20 The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to  
21 make such expenditures within the limits of funds and bor-  
22 rowing authority available to it and in accordance with  
23 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
24 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
25 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended

(31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.

#### LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$10,639,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which eighteen are for replacement only, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding \$30,000; *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100 per diem.



## 1 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## 2 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

3 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-  
4 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of  
5 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof  
6 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that  
7 Bureau, as follows:

## 8 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

9 For engineering and economic investigations of proposed  
10 Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conserva-  
11 tion and development plans and activities preliminary to the  
12 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-  
13 justment, or extension of existing projects, including not to  
14 exceed \$400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to  
15 remain available until expended, \$10,354,000, of which  
16 \$9,054,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and  
17 \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River develop-  
18 ment fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall  
19 be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation  
20 requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Pro-*  
21 *vided further*, That \$370,000 of this appropriation shall be  
22 transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service  
23 for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required  
24 by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat.  
25 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive

1 equal consideration and be coordinated with other features  
2 of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of  
3 Reclamation.

4 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

5 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-  
6 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmis-  
7 sion facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized  
8 by law, to remain available until expended, \$182,433,000,  
9 of which \$80,000,000 shall be derived from the reclama-  
10 tion fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall  
11 be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities  
12 within those areas covered by power wheeling service con-  
13 tracts which include provision for service to Federal estab-  
14 lishments and preferred customers, except those transmission  
15 facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore  
16 appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry  
17 out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which  
18 the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is  
19 unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal  
20 projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred  
21 customer: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be made  
22 available under this appropriation for the construction in  
23 Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of the inter-  
24 ceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit which  
25 terminates at any point east of Port Chicago.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$40,219,000, of which \$30,758,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,605,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

## LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, \$12,307,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under



1 the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended,  
2 not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the  
3 making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the con-  
4 tract is entered into shall be made only on the same con-  
5 ditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August  
6 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

7 UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

8 For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as au-  
9 thorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to  
10 remain available until expended, \$62,300,000, of which  
11 \$57,800,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado  
12 River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of  
13 April 11, 1956, and \$4,500,000 shall be available for con-  
14 struction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities author-  
15 ized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of  
16 the Department through or in cooperation with State or other  
17 Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are  
18 hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein  
19 appropriated shall be available for construction or operation  
20 of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering  
21 any National Monument.

22 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses of general administration and  
24 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Recla-  
25 mation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclama-

1 tion, \$10,400,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund  
2 and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19,  
3 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of any other  
4 appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or  
5 functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general  
6 administrative expenses.

#### 7 SPECIAL FUNDS

8 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the rec-  
9 lamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colo-  
10 rado River development fund, are appropriated from the  
11 special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17,  
12 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43  
13 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C.  
14 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon  
15 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended  
16 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-  
17 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads  
18 "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administra-  
19 tive Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special  
20 fund from which derived.

#### 21 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

22 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be  
23 available for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger  
24 motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
25 for replacement only; payment of claims for damage to or

1 loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activi-  
2 ties of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as other-  
3 wise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons  
4 on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-  
5 ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation  
6 and administration of interstate compacts without reimburse-  
7 ment or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for in-  
8 formation or evidence concerning violations of law involving  
9 property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation;  
10 performance of the functions specified under the head "Opera-  
11 tion and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclama-  
12 tion, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945;  
13 preparation and dissemination of useful information including  
14 recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies  
15 of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and  
16 recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such  
17 areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August  
18 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) : *Provided*, That no part  
19 of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant  
20 to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377) , for expenses  
21 other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation  
22 projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and  
23 amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and gen-  
24 eral engineering and research under the head "General In-  
25 vestigations".



1 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the  
2 appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilita-  
3 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those  
4 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under  
5 the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization  
6 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head  
7 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations  
8 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the de-  
9 velopment of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may  
10 be expended through or in cooperation with State and other  
11 Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby  
12 authorized.

13 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the  
14 performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Rec-  
15 lamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner  
16 provided by law.

17 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-  
18 mation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which  
19 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but  
20 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,  
21 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,  
22 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this para-  
23 graph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the  
24 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

1       No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation  
2 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from  
3 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular  
4 benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation  
5 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,  
6 or (c) of any individual when such district, organization,  
7 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in  
8 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into  
9 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the  
10 Bureau of Reclamation.

11       Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the  
12 appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work  
13 by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit  
14 and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or  
15 no acceptable bid has been received and, other than other-  
16 wise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to  
17 meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the  
18 construction allotment for any project from the appropria-  
19 tion "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act  
20 shall be available for construction work by force account:  
21 *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work per-  
22 formed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of  
23 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

## 1                   BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 2                                   CONSTRUCTION

3       For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
4   substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,  
5   \$41,220,000, to remain available until expended.

## 6                                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

7       For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
8   the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric  
9   power and energy, \$14,980,000.

## 10                               ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11       Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration  
12   shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon  
13   the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made  
14   herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be avail-  
15   able in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made  
16   for operation and maintenance shall be available only for  
17   the service of the current fiscal year.

18       Other than as may be necessary to meet local emer-  
19   gencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation  
20   for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Ad-  
21   ministration shall be available for construction work by force  
22   account or on a hired-labor basis.



## 1           SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 2                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

3           For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
4 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
5 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
6 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
7 the southeastern power area, including purchase of one  
8 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,000,000.

## 9           SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## 10                   CONSTRUCTION

11          For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
12 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative  
13 expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions  
14 of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C.  
15 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$2,-  
16 610,000, to remain available until expended.

## 17                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

18          For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
19 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
20 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
21 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
22 the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to

1 exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only,  
2 \$1,680,000.

3 CONTINUING FUND

4 Not to exceed \$4,500,000 shall be available during the  
5 current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in  
6 connection with the purchase of electric power and energy,  
7 and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available  
10 for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office),  
11 with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency recon-  
12 struction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utili-  
13 ties, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by  
14 fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*,  
15 That no funds shall be made available under this authority  
16 until funds specifically made available to the Department of  
17 the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

18 SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
19 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
20 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
21 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
22 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-  
23 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the  
24 Interior.

25 SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available

1 for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facili-  
2 ties, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to  
3 efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be re-  
4 imbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the  
5 same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932  
6 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs  
7 of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services ren-  
8 dered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
9 time such reimbursements are received.

10 SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this  
11 Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made  
12 available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any pur-  
13 poses other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the  
14 Southwestern Power Administration.

## 15 TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in  
18 carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
19 as amended, including the employment of aliens; services  
20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
21 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft;  
22 publication and dissemination of atomic information; pur-  
23 chase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment  
24 expenses (not to exceed \$30,000) ; reimbursement of the  
25 General Services Administration for security guard services;



1 hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$2,261,073,000, and any  
2 moneys (except sums received from disposal of property  
3 under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42  
4 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstand-  
5 ing the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes  
6 (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Pro-*  
7 *vided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for  
8 objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the  
9 certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expendi-  
10 ture and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature  
11 thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum  
12 therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*,  
13 That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made  
14 to other agencies of the Government for the performance of  
15 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such  
16 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the  
17 appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That  
18 no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with  
19 the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of con-  
20 tractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or con-  
21 tracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee  
22 for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000  
23 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system  
24 where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

## PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and eighty-four for replacement only (including three at not to exceed \$3,000 each), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of one aircraft; \$363,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrangement for construction of all or a part of such plant by private industry.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the procurement of materials, services,

1 or other costs which are a part of work or activities for  
2 which funds have been provided in any other appropriation  
3 available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate  
4 transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall  
5 subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual  
6 application determined in accordance with generally accepted  
7 accounting principles.

8 Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made avail-  
9 able for the fiscal year 1965 for "Operating expenses"  
10 and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred  
11 between such appropriations, but neither such appropria-  
12 tion, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased  
13 by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and  
14 any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Ap-  
15 propriations Committees of the House and Senate.

16 No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to  
17 confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is  
18 a member of an organization or party that advocates the  
19 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
20 or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds,  
21 upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commis-  
22 sion on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that  
23 reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal  
24 to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any  
25 person who advocates or who is a member of an organiza-



tion or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

#### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as herein-after provided.

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT

##### LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an

1 accrual basis, including not to exceed \$6,000 for official  
2 entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval  
3 or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances  
4 therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as author-  
5 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by  
6 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at  
7 rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day: *Provided,*  
8 That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for services of  
9 individuals employed at rates in excess of \$50 per day.

10                   TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

11       PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

12       For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the  
13 Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16  
14 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and  
15 operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed two  
16 hundred and eight for replacement only) and hire of pas-  
17 senger motor vehicles, \$47,915,000, to remain available  
18 until expended.

19                   DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

20                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21       For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
22 United States member of the Delaware River Basin Com-  
23 mission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$39,000.

## 1 CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

2 For payment of the United States share of the current  
3 expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as au-  
4 thorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$92,000.

## 5 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## 6 PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

7 For an additional amount for expenses necessary to  
8 enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes  
9 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541), in-  
10 cluding services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals  
12 not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$4,000,000.

## 13 TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## 14 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

15 SEC. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the  
16 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year  
17 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
18 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor  
19 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed  
20 at \$1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum  
21 shall be \$1,950.

22 SEC. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in



1 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation  
2 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United  
3 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of  
4 which is owned by the Government of the United States)  
5 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such  
6 person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person  
7 in the service of the United States on the date of enactment  
8 of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a  
9 declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United  
10 States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes alle-  
11 giance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland  
12 or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States  
13 for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose  
14 of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall  
15 be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of  
16 this section with respect to his status have been complied  
17 with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false  
18 affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction,  
19 shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not  
20 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
21 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in sub-  
22 stitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided*  
23 *further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee  
24 contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable  
25 in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not

1 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to  
2 nationals of those countries allied with the United States in  
3 the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of  
4 translators, or to temporary employment in the field service  
5 (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

6 SEC. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments  
7 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,  
8 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the  
9 activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters  
10 allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with  
11 title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

12 SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current  
13 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid  
14 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or  
15 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to  
16 approve the nomination of said person.

17 SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in  
18 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used  
19 to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future  
20 volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such  
21 volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the under-  
22 standing that latest published cumulative annual pocket  
23 parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished  
24 free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the  
25 current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest,

1 or in excess of \$6.50 per volume for the current or future  
2 volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

3 SEC. 506. Funds made available by this or any other  
4 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of  
5 the corporations and agencies subject to the Government  
6 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),  
7 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds  
8 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Colum-  
9 bia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of  
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and the objects specified  
11 under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applica-  
12 ble to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise speci-  
13 fied in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*,  
14 .That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative  
15 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other  
16 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be  
17 correspondingly reduced.

18 SEC. 507. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July  
19 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including cur-  
20 rencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be  
21 used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appro-  
22 priations are made for the current fiscal year (including the  
23 carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of  
24 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to  
25 the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency



1 concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange  
2 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may  
3 be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar  
4 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law,  
5 without reimbursement to the Treasury.

6 SEC. 508. During the current fiscal year, any foreign  
7 currencies held by the United States which have been or  
8 may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activi-  
9 ties of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treas-  
10 ury in unfunded accounts.

11 SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
12 or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure  
13 by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or  
14 propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legisla-  
15 tion pending before Congress.

16 This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appro-  
17 priation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives June 16, 1964.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

JUNE 17 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations







July 31, 1964

Passed as reported S. 1531, to increase the appropriations authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Mont. p. 16948

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1658, authorizing construction of the Central Arizona project, Ariz. and N. Mex. p. D617

19. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration this bill, H. R. 11579. p. D617
20. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 5498, authorizing sale of public lands not needed for Federal program requirements; and H. R. 3070, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to administration of the public lands. p. D617
21. WOOL. Passed as reported S. 1778, permitting wool products to be sold without a label whenever disclosure of wool fiber content is not necessary for the protection of the consumer. p. 16974
22. TECHNOLOGY. Passed as reported H. R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. pp. 16985-91
23. ROADS. Concurred in the House amendments to the Senate amendments on H. R. 10503, the road authorization bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17006-7
24. HOUSING; LOANS. Passed with amendments S. 3049, the housing bill (pp. 16984-5, 16992-020). This bill includes provisions to extend certain rural housing programs (under Secs. 511, 512, 513, and 515 of the Housing Act of 1949) until October 1, 1965; authorize \$150,000,000 additional for direct housing loans administered by the Farmers Home Administration; increase from \$100,000 to \$300,000 the maximum amount of a loan which may be insured under Sec. 515 (b) for rental housing and related facilities for the elderly in rural areas; make immigrant farm laborers permanently residing in the U. S. after legal entry for permanent residence, as well as citizen farm laborers, eligible to occupy housing financed with loans under Sec. 514(f) of the Housing Act of 1949; and authorize grants for low-rent housing for domestic farm labor. Rejected, 19-64, an amendment by Sen. Tower to substitute a more limited version for the bill as reported (pp. 16999-007).

SENATE - August 1

25. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on H. R. 11380, the foreign-aid authorization bill. pp. 17103, 17132-35
26. EDUCATION. Passed without amendment S. 3060, to amend the National Defense Education Act, including a 3-year extension of that Act, and a 2-year extension of impacted-areas education legislation. pp. 17103-19
27. METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES. Passed without amendment S. 970, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. p. 17132

28. RESEARCH. Sen. Carlson stated that "the enormously productive agriculture of the United States today rests directly upon the research and educational effectiveness of the land-grant colleges and universities and the Department of Agriculture," and inserted an editorial on the subject. pp. 17087-8
29. ECONOMY. Sen. Humphrey inserted two articles discussing the President's optimism over economy. pp. 17090-1
30. COFFEE. Sen. Douglas called attention to the fact that coffee prices increased approximately one-half cent per pound in the day following the passage of the "coffee bill;" stated that "this is only the beginning," and urged a close watch on what happens to coffee prices. p. 17136
31. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 1892, to repeal the Pittman Act of 1919 which had provided for grants of public lands in Nev. in order to encourage reclamation of desert lands. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17130
32. AJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 3. p. 17136

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

33. WILDERNESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Fraser expressing his "unequivocal support" for the wilderness bill. pp. A4035-6
34. COTTON. Rep. Teague inserted an address by B. C. Jackson, general chairman of the 25th annual American Cotton Congress, "Cotton's Past, Present, and Future." pp. A4039-40

BILLS INTRODUCED

35. RECREATION. S. 3054, by Sen. McGee, to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee
36. FOREIGN TRADE. S. Con. Res. 91, by Sen. Douglas, to express the sense of the Congress that the United States should, on agricultural commodities as well as other commodities, bargain and negotiate in good faith as it is pledged to do under the Reciprocal Trade Act; to Finance Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 16900-1

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS AUG. 3:

Agriculture appropriations, S. Appropriations (exec. - to mark up).  
Proxmire dairy bill, H. Agriculture.  
Pay bill, conferees (exec).

oOo







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D.C. 20250

Official business Postage and fees paid

U. S. Department of Agriculture

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued Aug. 6, 1964

For actions of Aug. 5, 1964

88th-2nd; No. 151

### CONTENTS

|                            |                           |                        |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Administrative law.....44  | Fisheries.....38          | Property.....31        |
| Appalachia.....41          | Flood control.....45      | Public debt.....6      |
| Appropriations.....1,3     | Foreign aid.....8         | Public works.....3     |
| ASC committeemen.....18    | Forest products.....22    | Reclamation.....19     |
| Automation.....13,34,43    | Forestry.....33           | Recreation.....2,30    |
| Budget.....5               | Housing.....14            | Research.....40        |
| Civil rights.....35        | Lands.....18,39           | Roads.....36           |
| Containers.....15          | Life insurance.....4      | Seed screenings.....18 |
| Crop insurance.....18      | Manpower.....34           | Soil resources.....25  |
| Dairy.....20               | Meat imports.....12,29,37 | Tariff.....17,27       |
| Electrification.....7,16   | National parks.....46     | Taxation.....6         |
| Employment.....24          | Natural resources.....33  | Water.....10           |
| Farm labor.....23          | Pay.....21                | Watersheds.....20      |
| Federal aid.....31         | Personnel.....4,21,28,32  |                        |
| Federal-State relations..9 | Poverty.....11,26         |                        |

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee reported resolution to send meat-import restriction bill to conference and Rep. Roosevelt commended this action. House began debate on poverty bill. House committee reported housing bill. Senate committee voted to report land and water conservation fund bill. Senate committee reported public works appropriation bill. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill.

### SENATE

1. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 11296. Conferees were appointed. pp. 17509-15, 17528-35, 17544-7, 17554-77
2. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3846, to establish a Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in the improvement of outdoor recreation facilities. p. D642



Passed as reported S. 2048, to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation area. pp. 17577-8

Sen. Metcalf inserted a speech urging that "all of us must shift our outdoor recreation emphasis from the national panorama to specific projects which will improve our local communities." pp. 17490-1

3. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 11579 (S. Rept. 1326). p. 17482
4. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 1974, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act with regard to designation of beneficiary. p. D643
5. BUDGET. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized the rising number of Federal employees and called "the Kennedy-Johnson administration...the most extravagant regime that has ever occupied the White House." p. 17485
6. NATIONAL DEBT; TAXATION. Passed as reported S. 2281, to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt and the tax structure. pp. 17585-8
7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Metcalf called for greater Federal participation in the interregional transmission system and inserted an article by Sen. Neuberger in a similar vein, "Surrender in the West." pp. 17489-90  
Sen. Morse inserted a corrected version of his speech delivered Aug. 4, 1964 on electric power in the Pacific Northwest. pp. 17537-44
8. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Long, Mo., called the foreign aid program "an effective weapon in today's struggle between freedom and communism" and outlined the contribution of various Mo. universities to the AID program. pp. 17506-7
9. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Sen. Hill inserted a speech by Sen. Muskie, "Intergovernmental Relations" calling for the three levels of government to work together. pp. 17589-91
10. WATER. Sen. Morse spoke against Westlands water distribution system contract and inserted statements which "establish beyond a doubt its illegality under existing reclamation laws." pp. 17493-503  
HOUSE
11. POVERTY. Began debate on H. R. 11377, the poverty bill. pp. 17610-52
12. MEAT IMPORTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to send to conference H. R. 1839, the meat-import restriction bill (p. 17668), and Rep. Roosevelt commended this action (pp. 17595-6).  
Rep. Nelsen inserted his testimony before the Rules Committee in favor of a resolution for House concurrence in the beef-import amendments adopted by the Senate to H. R. 1839. pp. 17656-7
13. AUTOMATION. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17610
14. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12175, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities (H. Rept. 1703). p. 17668

# Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session }

SENATE }

REPORT  
No. 1326

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

AUGUST 5, 1964.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 11579]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom<sup>8</sup> was referred the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate, with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

|                                           |                    |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Amount of bill as passed House.....       | \$4, 325, 969, 200 |
| Amount of increase by Senate (net).....   | 117, 144, 000      |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate..... | 4, 443, 113, 200   |
| Amount of estimates for 1965.....         | 4, 440, 749, 000   |
| Amount of appropriations, 1964.....       | 4, 407, 240, 700   |
| The bill as reported to the Senate—       |                    |
| Over the estimates for 1965.....          | 2, 364, 200        |
| Over the appropriation for 1964.....      | 35, 872, 500       |

## PERSONAL PROPERTY

It is the feeling of the committee that the agencies included in this bill have not made maximum use of excess personal property available through the General Services Administration. The committee urges all agencies to make vigorous efforts during the coming year to utilize General Services Administration property and when fiscal year 1966 budget estimates are justified to make a report on accomplishments and comparisons with previous years.

## TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

## CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964-----      | \$10,800,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965-----    | 13,295,000   |
| House allowance-----          | 13,295,000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 13,295,000   |

The committee recommends \$13,295,000, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

The funds appropriated under this heading are to cover the cost of maintenance and operation of the national cemetery system; the purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; and the maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries.

During the hearings, the committee noted a tendency to reallocate funds budgeted for maintenance and the purchase of operating equipment to personnel services and purchase of markers or other costs associated with the greater number of interments actually required over those budgeted for the most recent fiscal years. While the committee agrees with the Memorial Division that maintenance can be postponed while interments cannot, continual deferment of required maintenance is so expensive in the long run that the Government can no longer afford this type of economy. In addition, the record shows that the large increase in the number of visitations at Arlington National Cemetery following the burial of President Kennedy has necessitated an increase in the number of security guards and has resulted in increased costs for maintaining adjacent grave site areas.

The committee expects that the national cemeteries will be properly maintained, and that if increased interments and/or the increased costs of taking care of the visiting public at Arlington indicate the need for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation, the Department of the Army will submit the necessary request to the Bureau of the Budget.

## RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964-----      | \$19,115,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965-----    | 19,795,000   |
| House allowance-----          | 20,590,000   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 22,269,000   |



In recommending \$22,269,000 the committee approved the House action with respect to general investigations with the following exceptions: The committee restored the funds requested in the budget but deleted by the House for Nenana River, Alaska, in the amount of \$75,000, and for the coasts of the Hawaiian Islands; and rejected the House increases in the budgeted amounts for the comprehensive studies of the Pascagoula River Basin in the amount of \$75,000 and the Wabash River Basin in the amount of \$353,000.

#### NENANA RIVER, ALASKA

The committee feels that there is nothing in the agreement between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior which would preclude the Corps of Engineers from undertaking specific studies that they were directed to make by a competent committee of the Congress. The committee believes that agreement merely assigns to the Department of the Interior the responsibility of assuming leadership for comprehensive studies.

#### COASTS OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

The committee feels that since the State had considered Honokahau Harbor of sufficient importance to justify State development, there is no justification to then deny that harbor the consideration which would normally be accorded other harbors in the general area. The fact that the total project cost exceeded the amount the State felt it could provide is not sufficient justification. Since the \$56,000 budgeted for the study of the coasts of the Hawaiian Islands is for the study of Honokahau Harbor and two outstanding authorities for surveys of Kewalo-Ali Wai Basin and Kalaupapa Landing, the committee has recommended the budgeted amount for these studies.

#### COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN STUDIES

Last year, the committee was very critical of the control being exercised by the executive agencies over the degree of refinement and, consequently, the estimated cost of the comprehensive river basin surveys. This year, the committee is pleased to note that in the light of the committee's concern and comments with respect to coordination between the departments, the program contemplated by the four agencies last year and tentatively estimated to cost \$400 million has been substantially reduced. In fact, the testimony before our committee shows that the total cost of the comprehensive studies underway and planned for later years is about \$88 million. The committee has been informed that with respect to coordination an interdepartment staff committee of the four departments has been meeting continuously since last spring. The committee understands that the departments have formulated joint guidelines to limit the detail and cost of comprehensive basin studies consistent with the policies and standards previously approved.

The executive agencies are to be commended for the very realistic reappraisal they have made of the detail and cost of the comprehensive basin studies they are making. While the committee is not convinced these studies are now reduced to the standards contemplated by the Select Committee on Water Resources or the President

when he accepted a goal of 1970 for the completion of comprehensive studies on all the major river basins of the Nation, certainly the present estimates are reasonable. The major task ahead will be the exercise of vigilance to prevent a reversal of the present thinking which could result in a skyrocketing of the cost estimates.

Inasmuch as the budget program represents a well coordinated plan for the prosecution of the program of comprehensive surveys in fiscal year 1965, the committee recommends that the House allowance for the Pascagoula River Basin be reduced from \$200,000 to the budget estimate of \$125,000; and that the House allowance for the Wabash River Basin survey be reduced from \$778,000 to the \$425,000 recommended in the budget. It is understandable that local interests would press for an appropriation equal to the corps expressed capability on their particular study. While the budget estimate for the continuation of 19 comprehensive studies is \$4,500,000, the corps expressed capability for 20 comprehensive studies for which funds were requested was \$7,843,000. A total appropriation of this magnitude would be beyond the capability of the corps and would necessitate increases in personnel ceilings at a time when the administration is attempting to reduce Federal employment. The committee feels that one area should not be given preference over another, nor should the Federal agencies be encouraged to conclude that the committee has reversed its position of last year with respect to the need for keeping the expenditures for these studies within bounds.

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The committee is of the opinion that reductions in the estimated cost of navigation and flood control studies comparable to those effected in the comprehensive river basin surveys could be made without in any way impairing the reliability of the information upon which the recommendations for the construction of projects are made. The committee, therefore, desires that the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, review the procedures established for approving a plan of survey and the sequence of operations with a view to obtaining a more adequate control over the degree of refinement to which the various steps are carried out.

A review of the backlog of authorized review reports indicates that frequently the ink is not dry on an unfavorable report before requests are made to review the report. Unless there are unusual circumstances involved, the committee doubts the desirability of reviewing a prior report unless a reasonable period has elapsed since the previous report was completed.

While the committee strongly supports an active and well-balanced survey program for the development of a meaningful water resource program, it questions the present tendency of the Federal agencies having a responsibility in this field making endless studies and restudies, apparently for the purpose of keeping their staffs occupied.

As in the past, the committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of budget recommendations, and

expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys where feasible. In the allocation of the balance of the increase recommended it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee.

General investigations, fiscal year 1965

| Item                                                                                      | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 | House allowance | Amount recommended by committee |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| (1)                                                                                       | (2)                                           | (3)             | (4)                             |
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS                                                                    |                                               |                 |                                 |
| 1. Surveys:                                                                               |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (a) Navigation studies.....                                                               | \$2,257,000                                   | \$2,618,000     | \$3,135,000                     |
| (b) Flood control studies.....                                                            | 5,835,000                                     | 6,576,000       | 7,166,000                       |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperatives studies.....                                               | 458,000                                       | 523,000         | 523,000                         |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies:                                                          |                                               |                 |                                 |
| Big Black River, Miss.....                                                                | 65,000                                        | 65,000          | 65,000                          |
| Big Muddy River, Ill.....                                                                 | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000                         |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H.....                                  | 275,000                                       | 275,000         | 275,000                         |
| Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.....                                                    | 130,000                                       | 130,000         | 130,000                         |
| Grand River Basin, Mich.....                                                              | 175,000                                       | 175,000         | 175,000                         |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C.....                                                  | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000                         |
| Missouri River Basin.....                                                                 | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000                         |
| Ohio River Basin review.....                                                              | 375,000                                       | 375,000         | 375,000                         |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.....                                                         | 125,000                                       | 200,000         | 125,000                         |
| Pearl River, Basin, Miss.....                                                             | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000                         |
| Puget Sound area, Washington.....                                                         | 275,000                                       | 275,000         | 275,000                         |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.....                               | 300,000                                       | 300,000         | 300,000                         |
| Sabine River, Tex.....                                                                    | 130,000                                       | 130,000         | 130,000                         |
| St. Johns River Basin, Maine.....                                                         | 75,000                                        | 75,000          | 75,000                          |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md.....                                           | 400,000                                       | 400,000         | 400,000                         |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin.....                                                        | 350,000                                       | 350,000         | 350,000                         |
| Wabash River, Ind. and Ill.....                                                           | 425,000                                       | 778,000         | 425,000                         |
| White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.....                                                       | 300,000                                       | 300,000         | 300,000                         |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg.....                                                         | 350,000                                       | 350,000         | 350,000                         |
| (e) Special studies:                                                                      |                                               |                 |                                 |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana..... | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000                         |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc).....       | 260,000                                       | 260,000         | 260,000                         |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.....                                               | 200,000                                       | 200,000         | 200,000                         |
| Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J.....                                                         | 150,000                                       | 150,000         | 150,000                         |
| Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.....                                                      | 200,000                                       | 200,000         | 200,000                         |
| Texas coast.....                                                                          | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000                         |
| Subtotal, surveys.....                                                                    | 14,035,000                                    | 15,830,000      | 16,509,000                      |
| 2. Collection and study of basic data:                                                    |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....                                           | 280,000                                       | 280,000         | 280,000                         |
| (b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....                                      | 480,000                                       | 480,000         | 480,000                         |
| (c) Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....      | 210,000                                       | 210,000         | 210,000                         |
| (d) International water studies.....                                                      | 85,000                                        | 85,000          | 85,000                          |
| (e) Flood plain studies.....                                                              | 725,000                                       | 725,000         | 725,000                         |
| Subtotal, collection and study of basic.....                                              | 1,780,000                                     | 1,780,000       | 1,780,000                       |
| 3. Research and development:                                                              |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (a) Coastal engineering research and development.....                                     | 850,000                                       | 850,000         | 850,000                         |
| (b) Hydrologic studies.....                                                               | 190,000                                       | 190,000         | 190,000                         |
| (c) Engineering studies.....                                                              |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (d) Plan formulation and evaluation studies.....                                          |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (e) Civil works investigations.....                                                       | 1,500,000                                     | 1,500,000       | 1,500,000                       |
| (f) Mississippi Basin model:                                                              |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (1) Construction.....                                                                     | 210,000                                       | 210,000         | 210,000                         |
| (2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.....                                            | 150,000                                       | 150,000         | 150,000                         |
| (3) Maintenance.....                                                                      |                                               |                 |                                 |
| (g) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.....                                | 1,080,000                                     | 1,080,000       | 1,080,000                       |
| Subtotal, research and development.....                                                   | 3,980,000                                     | 3,980,000       | 3,980,000                       |
| General reduction due to slippage.....                                                    |                                               | -1,000,000      |                                 |
| Total, general investigations.....                                                        | 19,795,000                                    | 20,590,000      | 22,269,000                      |



## CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964-----      | \$827, 146, 500 |
| Budget estimate, 1965-----    | 879, 808, 000   |
| House allowance-----          | 905, 767, 200   |
| Committee recommendation----- | 942, 791, 200   |

## ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

The committee has approved \$22,464,000 for advance engineering and design. This is \$793,000 above the amount allowed by the House and \$1,795,000 above the budget. The bill as recommended includes funds to initiate planning on 41 projects.

## ALLOCATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The allocation of the amount recommended by the committee for the individual project is shown in the accompanying table.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

7

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                               | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                               |                                           |                                          | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| Alabama:                                                                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                       | \$23,000,000                              | \$439,000                                | \$1,000,000                                      |                 | \$1,000,000         |                 | \$1,000,000                        |                 |
| Claiborne lock and dam                                                        | 28,400,000                                | 11,577,000                               | 8,000,000                                        |                 | 8,000,000           |                 | 8,000,000                          |                 |
| Holt lock and dam                                                             | 52,600,000                                | 652,000                                  |                                                  | \$134,000       |                     | \$134,000       |                                    | \$134,000       |
| Jones Bluff lock and dam                                                      | 53,200,000                                | 3,624,000                                | 6,000,000                                        |                 | 6,000,000           |                 | 6,000,000                          |                 |
| Millers Ferry lock and dam                                                    | 7,220,000                                 | 4,744,000                                | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 2,476,000                          |                 |
| Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel                                                 | 263,000,000                               | 924,000                                  |                                                  | **100,000       |                     | 100,000         |                                    | 225,000         |
| Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.                                  |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Tombigbee River and Tributaries, Ala. and Miss. (See Mississippi.)            |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Alaska:                                                                       |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)                                   |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Repairs on other navigation projects in Alaska                                | 30,700,000                                | 225,000                                  |                                                  | 750,000         |                     | 750,000         | 500,000                            | 750,000         |
| Snettisham power project                                                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Arizona:                                                                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Alamo Reservoir                                                               | 13,300,000                                | 3,590,000                                | 2,500,000                                        |                 | 2,500,000           |                 | 2,500,000                          |                 |
| Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir                             | 19,900,000                                | 329,000                                  |                                                  | 251,000         |                     | 251,000         |                                    | 251,000         |
| Pinal Creek                                                                   | 1,440,000                                 |                                          |                                                  | 55,000          |                     | 55,000          |                                    | 55,000          |
| Tucson diversion channel                                                      | 6,520,000                                 | 2,469,000                                | 2,400,000                                        |                 | 2,400,000           |                 | 2,400,000                          |                 |
| Arkansas:                                                                     |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:                        |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification                              | 133,000,000                               | 90,005,000                               | 15,000,000                                       |                 | 15,000,000          |                 | 15,000,000                         |                 |
| (b) Navigation locks and dams                                                 | 447,000,000                               | 16,301,000                               | **51,500,000                                     |                 | 47,000,000          |                 | 51,500,000                         |                 |
| Beaver Reservoir                                                              | 45,500,000                                | 39,096,000                               | 4,500,000                                        |                 | 4,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000                          |                 |
| Dardanelle lock and dam                                                       | 79,000,000                                | 52,232,000                               | 10,000,000                                       |                 | 10,000,000          |                 | 10,000,000                         |                 |
| Degray Reservoir                                                              | 50,000,000                                | 4,909,000                                | 7,100,000                                        |                 | 7,100,000           |                 | 7,100,000                          |                 |
| De Queen Reservoir                                                            | 10,400,000                                | 275,000                                  |                                                  | 245,000         |                     | 245,000         |                                    | 245,000         |
| Dierks Reservoir                                                              | 9,780,000                                 | 180,000                                  |                                                  | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                                    | 150,000         |
| Galland City                                                                  | 948,000                                   | 480,000                                  | 250,000                                          |                 | 250,000             |                 | 250,000                            |                 |
| Gillham Reservoir                                                             | 13,400,000                                | 1,619,000                                | 2,500,000                                        |                 | 2,500,000           |                 | 2,500,000                          |                 |
| Manice Bayou, upstream extension                                              | 903,000                                   | 65,000                                   | 100,000                                          |                 | 100,000             |                 | 100,000                            |                 |
| Millwood Reservoir                                                            | 50,000,000                                | 24,855,000                               | 17,697,000                                       |                 | 17,697,000          |                 | 17,697,000                         |                 |
| Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit                                        | 1,410,000                                 | 50,000                                   | 350,000                                          |                 | 350,000             |                 | 350,000                            |                 |
| Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.                                       | 79,600,000                                | 1,755,000                                | 3,000,000                                        |                 | 3,000,000           |                 | 3,000,000                          |                 |
| Ozark lock and dam                                                            | 36,300,000                                | 884,000                                  | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000                          |                 |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La. and Tex. | 10,700,000                                | 9,714,000                                | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000                            |                 |
| Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts                      | 1,325,000                                 | 38,000                                   |                                                  | 87,000          |                     | 87,000          |                                    | 87,000          |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br><br>(1)                     | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br><br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br><br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                         |                                               |                                              | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| California:                                                             |                                               |                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam.....<br>(FC)                               | \$16,400,000                                  | \$350,000                                    | \$750,000                                        | -----           | \$750,000           | -----           | \$750,000                          | -----           |
| Bear Creek.....<br>(FC)                                                 | 3,310,000                                     | 1,030,000                                    | 900,000                                          | -----           | 900,000             | -----           | 900,000                            | -----           |
| Buchanan Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                         | 14,800,000                                    | 1,125,900                                    | -----                                            | \$200,000       | -----               | \$200,000       | -----                              | \$200,000       |
| Camanche Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                         | 9,600,000                                     | 6,250,000                                    | 3,350,000                                        | -----           | 3,350,000           | -----           | 3,350,000                          | -----           |
| Corte Madera Creek.....<br>(FC)                                         | 5,840,000                                     | 20,000                                       | -----                                            | 100,000         | -----               | 100,000         | -----                              | 100,000         |
| Dana Point Harbor.....<br>(N)                                           | 3,760,000                                     | 95,000                                       | -----                                            | 100,000         | -----               | 100,000         | -----                              | 100,000         |
| Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement.....<br>(FC) | 47,000,000                                    | 200,000                                      | -----                                            | 450,000         | -----               | 450,000         | -----                              | 450,000         |
| Hidden Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                           | 16,100,000                                    | 100,000                                      | -----                                            | 250,000         | -----               | 250,000         | -----                              | 250,000         |
| Imperial Beach (reimbursement).....<br>(BE)                             | 178,000                                       | 46,000                                       | 26,000                                           | -----           | 26,000              | -----           | 26,000                             | -----           |
| Los Angeles County drainage area.....<br>(FC)                           | 318,000,000                                   | 268,520,000                                  | 15,000,000                                       | -----           | 15,000,000          | -----           | 15,000,000                         | -----           |
| Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries.....<br>(FC)                    | 12,450,000                                    | 8,441,000                                    | 1,000,000                                        | -----           | 1,000,000           | -----           | 1,000,000                          | -----           |
| Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor.....<br>(N)                               | 4,253,000                                     | 3,653,000                                    | 600,000                                          | -----           | 600,000             | -----           | 600,000                            | -----           |
| Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)                   |                                               |                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Merced River Reservoirs (New Exchequer Dam).....<br>(FC)                | 9,780,000                                     | 25,000                                       | -----                                            | 50,000          | 200,000             | -----           | 200,000                            | -----           |
| Monterey Harbor.....<br>(N)                                             | 5,080,000                                     | 96,000                                       | -----                                            | 90,000          | -----               | 90,000          | -----                              | 150,000         |
| Mormon Slough.....<br>(FC)                                              | 2,060,000                                     | 50,000                                       | -----                                            | 75,000          | -----               | 75,000          | -----                              | 75,000          |
| New Don Pedro Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                    | 5,859,000                                     | 95,000                                       | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | -----           | 150,000                            | -----           |
| New Melones Reservoir.....<br>(MP)                                      | 119,000,000                                   | 224,000                                      | -----                                            | 450,000         | -----               | -----           | 700,000                            | 700,000         |
| Oakland Harbor.....<br>(N)                                              | 7,360,000                                     | -----                                        | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | 110,000         | -----                              | 110,000         |
| Oroville Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                         | 66,375,000                                    | 18,659,000                                   | 9,000,000                                        | -----           | 8,390,000           | -----           | 8,390,000                          | -----           |
| Poind Maqui to San Pedro (reimbursement).....<br>(BE)                   | 7,600,000                                     | -----                                        | 196,000                                          | -----           | 196,000             | -----           | 196,000                            | -----           |
| Redwood Creek.....<br>(FC)                                              | 2,850,000                                     | 50,000                                       | -----                                            | 125,000         | -----               | 125,000         | -----                              | 125,000         |
| Sacramento River bank protection.....<br>(FC)                           | 15,800,000                                    | 981,000                                      | 1,150,000                                        | -----           | 1,150,000           | -----           | 1,250,000                          | -----           |
| Sacramento River deep water ship channel.....<br>(N)                    | 41,340,000                                    | 38,746,000                                   | 350,000                                          | -----           | 350,000             | -----           | 350,000                            | -----           |
| Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries.....<br>(FC)           | 11,900,000                                    | 6,902,000                                    | 1,530,000                                        | -----           | 1,530,000           | -----           | 1,530,000                          | -----           |
| Santa Barbara Harbor.....<br>(N)                                        | 3,090,000                                     | -----                                        | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | 150,000         | -----                              | 150,000         |
| Santa Cruz Harbor.....<br>(N)                                           | 1,760,000                                     | 1,635,000                                    | 105,000                                          | -----           | 105,000             | -----           | 105,000                            | -----           |
| Tahchevah Creek.....<br>(FC)                                            | 1,440,000                                     | 280,000                                      | 830,000                                          | -----           | 830,000             | -----           | 830,000                            | -----           |
| Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement).....<br>(BE)                      | 1,140,000                                     | 122,000                                      | 224,000                                          | -----           | 224,000             | -----           | 224,000                            | -----           |
| Walnut Creek.....<br>(FC)                                               | 21,800,000                                    | 524,000                                      | 1,810,000                                        | -----           | 1,810,000           | -----           | 1,810,000                          | -----           |
| West Fork Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                        | 5,500,000                                     | 243,000                                      | -----                                            | 207,000         | -----               | 207,000         | -----                              | 207,000         |
| Colorado:                                                               |                                               |                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Trinidad Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                         | 21,000,000                                    | 782,000                                      | -----                                            | -----           | 750,000             | -----           | 750,000                            | -----           |
| Connecticut:                                                            |                                               |                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Ansonia-Derby.....<br>(FC)                                              | 5,620,000                                     | 100,000                                      | -----                                            | 175,000         | -----               | 175,000         | -----                              | 175,000         |
| Black Rock Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                       | 5,600,000                                     | 200,000                                      | -----                                            | 50,000          | -----               | 50,000          | -----                              | 50,000          |
| Coldbrook River Reservoir.....<br>(FC)                                  | 14,500,000                                    | 524,000                                      | 500,000                                          | -----           | 500,000             | -----           | 500,000                            | -----           |



| <i>Connecticut River below Hartford, North Cove at Old Saybrook</i> |                                                                                                                 |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------|-------------|
| (N)                                                                 |                                                                                                                 |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (FC)                                                                |                                                                                                                 | 578,000     |  |  |  |  |  | 578,000    |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Hancock Brook Reservoir                                                                                         | 3,560,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,279,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Hop Brook Reservoir                                                                                             | 4,300,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 400,000    |             |
| (FC)                                                                | New London Barrier                                                                                              | 2,400,000   |  |  |  |  |  |            | 100,000     |
| (FC)                                                                | Northfield Brook Reservoir                                                                                      | 2,810,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,346,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Stamford                                                                                                        | 4,300,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                         | 6,400,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 2,300,000  |             |
| Delaware:                                                           |                                                                                                                 |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)      |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (BE)                                                                | Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)                                                            | 98,840,000  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,500,000 |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Florida:                                                                                                        | 957,000     |  |  |  |  |  | 110,000    |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Apalachicola River channel improvement                                                                          | 4,617,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 100,000    |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Canaveral Harbor                                                                                                | 8,880,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 3,900,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Central and southern Florida                                                                                    | 263,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 13,500,000 |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Cross-Florida Barge Canal                                                                                       | 145,300,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 4,000,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Four River Basin                                                                                                | 56,300,000  |  |  |  |  |  |            | 200,000     |
| (N)                                                                 | Intracoastal Waterway: Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River                                                    |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Miami Harbor                                                                                                    | 8,550,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 700,000    |             |
| (BE)                                                                | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)                                   | 2,580,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,076,000  |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Palm Beach Harbor                                                                                               | 520,000     |  |  |  |  |  | 10,000     |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Pensacola Harbor                                                                                                | 5,070,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,300,000  |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)                                                                               | 5,550,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 300,000    |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channel                                                                      | 5,084,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,254,000  |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Georgia:                                                                                                        | 1,000,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 150,000    |             |
| (MP)                                                                | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Carters Dam                                                                                                     | 40,600,000  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,000,000  |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin                                                                     | 610,000     |  |  |  |  |  | 340,000    |             |
| (NP)                                                                | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.                                                                              | 53,000,000  |  |  |  |  |  | 500,000    |             |
| Hawaii:                                                             |                                                                                                                 |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Haleiwa small boat harbor (sec. 107)                                                                            |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Hilo Harbor                                                                                                     | 22,536,000  |  |  |  |  |  | 550,000    |             |
| (R)                                                                 | Kahului Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                     | 2,620,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 1,000,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Kawainui Swamp                                                                                                  | 1,500,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 700,000    |             |
| (N)                                                                 | Nawiliwili Harbor (sec. 107)                                                                                    |             |  |  |  |  |  |            | 3 (144,000) |
| Idaho:                                                              |                                                                                                                 |             |  |  |  |  |  |            |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Blackfoot Reservoir                                                                                             | 870,000     |  |  |  |  |  | 46,000     |             |
| (MP)                                                                | Dworshak (Brues Eddy) Reservoir                                                                                 | 202,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 8,500,000  |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Heise-Roberts extension                                                                                         | 1,830,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 70,000     |             |
| (FC)                                                                | Ririe Reservoir                                                                                                 | 7,400,000   |  |  |  |  |  | 400,000    |             |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                                                                        | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                                                        |                                           |                                          | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| Illinois:                                                                                                              |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (BA) Calumet River, bridges-----                                                                                       | \$16,830,000                              | \$1,980,000                              | **\$1,300,000                                    |                 | \$1,300,000         |                 | \$1,300,000                        |                 |
| (N) Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:<br>(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet<br>(1962 act)----- | 14,300,000                                | 606,000                                  | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 2,500,000           |                 | 2,500,000                          |                 |
| (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor<br>(1960 act)-----                                                  | 8,800,000                                 | 4,091,000                                | 2,500,000                                        |                 | 2,500,000           |                 | 2,500,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Carlyle Reservoir-----                                                                                            | 36,200,000                                | 20,380,000                               | 7,200,000                                        |                 | 7,200,000           |                 | 7,200,000                          |                 |
| (R) Chicago Harbor (breakwater)-----                                                                                   | 1,580,000                                 | 20,330,000                               | 700,000                                          |                 | 700,000             |                 | 700,000                            |                 |
| (FC) East St. Louis and vicinity-----                                                                                  | 21,300,000                                | 20,230,000                               | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000                            |                 |
| (FC) England Pond Levee-----                                                                                           | 779,000                                   |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     | \$30,000        |                                    |                 |
| (FC) Freeport-----                                                                                                     | 3,215,000                                 | 175,000                                  |                                                  | \$125,000       |                     | 125,000         |                                    | \$125,000       |
| (FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 1-----                                                                     | 1,580,000                                 | 80,000                                   |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 100,000                            |                 |
| (FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 2-----                                                                     | 1,060,000                                 | 66,000                                   |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 100,000                            |                 |
| (N) Imminis Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I,<br>Illinois and Indiana-----                                     | 85,200,000                                | 57,122,000                               | 5,000,000                                        |                 | 5,000,000           |                 | 5,000,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Indian Crane Drainage District-----                                                                               | 5,700,000                                 | 150,000                                  |                                                  | 96,000          |                     | 96,000          |                                    | 96,000          |
| (N) Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)-----                                                            | 63,800,000                                | 400,000                                  |                                                  | 400,000         |                     | 400,000         | 60,000                             | 400,000         |
| (FC) Kaskaskia River-----                                                                                              | 3,970,000                                 | 80,000                                   |                                                  | 140,000         |                     | 140,000         |                                    | 140,000         |
| (FC) McTea Creek Drainage and Levee District-----                                                                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (N) Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers,<br>Ill. and Mo.<br>(a) Regulating works-----                   | 64,400,000                                | 52,956,000                               | 2,000,000                                        |                 | 2,000,000           |                 | 2,000,000                          |                 |
| (b) Chain of Roeks-----                                                                                                | 43,000,000                                | 40,304,000                               | 1,300,000                                        |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Mount Carmel-----                                                                                                 | 1,510,000                                 | 275,000                                  | 700,000                                          |                 | 700,000             |                 | 700,000                            |                 |
| (FC) New Athens-----                                                                                                   | 1,900,000                                 | 108,000                                  | 120,000                                          |                 | 120,000             |                 | 120,000                            |                 |
| (FC) Oakley Reservoir-----                                                                                             | 32,400,000                                | 325,000                                  |                                                  | 275,000         |                     | 275,000         |                                    | 275,000         |
| (FC) Prairie Du Pont Levee and Sanitary District-----                                                                  | 984,000                                   |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     | 47,000          |                                    | 47,000          |
| (FC) Rend Lake Reservoir-----                                                                                          | 35,000,000                                | 1,501,000                                | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Richland Creek-----                                                                                               | 5,280,000                                 | 100,000                                  | 750,000                                          |                 | 750,000             |                 | 750,000                            |                 |
| (FC) Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee-----                                                                          | 1,200,000                                 | 200,000                                  |                                                  | 200,000         |                     | 200,000         |                                    | 200,000         |
| (FC) Saline River and tributaries-----                                                                                 | 8,530,000                                 |                                          |                                                  | **75,000        |                     | 75,000          |                                    | 75,000          |
| (FC) Shelbyville Reservoir-----                                                                                        | 27,300,000                                | 2,007,000                                | 2,800,000                                        |                 | 2,800,000           |                 | 2,800,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Sky Island Levee and Drainage District-----                                                                       | 8,900,000                                 | 211,000                                  |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 400,000                            |                 |
| (FC) Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island<br>Levee and Drainage District-----                      | 3,500,000                                 | 1,554,000                                | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000                          |                 |
| (FC) The Sny Basin-----                                                                                                | 13,800,000                                | 11,101,000                               | 1,700,000                                        |                 | 1,700,000           |                 | 1,700,000                          |                 |
| (FC) Tri-Pond levee-----                                                                                               | 1,280,000                                 | 253,000                                  | **470,000                                        |                 | 470,000             |                 | 470,000                            |                 |

|      |                                                                                           |             |             |         |         |            |           |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|
| (FO) | Indiana:                                                                                  | 27,200,000  | 275,000     | 165,000 | 165,000 | 500,000    | 165,000   |
| (FO) | <i>Brookville Reservoir</i>                                                               |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (N)  | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)                                   | 79,400,000  | 12,989,000  |         |         | 11,600,000 |           |
| (FO) | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                             | 16,100,000  | 3,868,000   |         |         | 2,800,000  |           |
| (FO) | Evansville                                                                                | 20,600,000  | 2,803,000   |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | Huntington Reservoir                                                                      |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. 1, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.) | 1,820,000   | 50,000      | 38,000  | 38,000  | 1,500,000  | 38,000    |
| (FO) | <i>Island levee, Indiana and Illinois</i>                                                 | 8,740,000   | 917,000     |         |         | 170,000    |           |
| (FO) | Levee unit 5, Wabash River                                                                | 1,630,000   | 1,460,000   |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | Mason J. Niblack levee                                                                    |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)                              |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | Mississinewa Reservoir                                                                    | 28,000,000  | 7,532,000   |         |         | 6,000,000  |           |
| (FO) | Monroe Reservoir                                                                          | 6,380,000   | 4,731,000   |         |         | 1,649,000  |           |
| (N)  | <i>Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky</i>                                       | 62,000,000  | 393,000     | 110,000 |         | 2,100,000  |           |
| (FO) | Salamonie Reservoir                                                                       | 18,000,000  | 6,028,000   |         |         | 5,600,000  |           |
| (N)  | <i>Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky</i>                                      | 61,700,000  | 526,000     |         |         | 1,000,000  |           |
| (FO) | Iowa:                                                                                     |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | <i>Central City Reservoir (deferred)</i>                                                  |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | Coralville Reservoir, Mebahey Bridge                                                      | 1,280,000   | 237,000     |         |         | 500,000    | 60,000    |
| (FO) | Des Moines                                                                                | 2,120,000   | 202,000     |         |         | 200,000    |           |
| (FO) | <i>Dubuque</i>                                                                            | 5,650,000   | 35,000      | 100,000 |         |            | 100,000   |
| (FO) | <b>Floyd River and tributaries</b>                                                        | 12,578,000  | 9,279,000   |         |         | 3,221,000  |           |
| (FO) | Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2                                               | 1,790,000   | 318,000     |         |         | 500,000    |           |
| (FO) | <i>Indian Creek Dam</i>                                                                   | 1,400,000   | 95,000      |         |         | 300,000    |           |
| (FO) | Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16                                              | 5,750,000   | 2,995,000   |         |         | 1,500,000  |           |
| (FO) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska                  | 88,940,000  | 34,861,000  |         |         | 4,000,000  |           |
| (N)  | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:               |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | (a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.                                                     | 110,000,000 | 90,794,000  |         |         | 3,500,000  |           |
| (FO) | (b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City                                                          | 128,000,000 | 113,613,000 |         |         | 4,000,000  |           |
| (FO) | (c) Kansas City to the mouth                                                              | 133,600,000 | 127,911,000 |         |         | 3,500,000  |           |
| (FO) | Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louis County Drainage District No. 13       | 3,000,000   | 2,309,000   |         | **0     | 100,000    |           |
| (FO) | Rathbun Reservoir                                                                         | 24,200,000  | 894,000     |         |         | 1,750,000  |           |
| (FO) | Red Rock Reservoir                                                                        | 85,000,000  | 28,970,000  |         |         | 16,500,000 |           |
| (FO) | Saylorville Reservoir                                                                     | 37,700,000  | 1,015,000   |         |         | 1,200,000  |           |
| (FO) | Kansas:                                                                                   |             |             |         |         |            |           |
| (FO) | <i>Atchison</i>                                                                           | 3,700,000   | 100,000     | 160,000 | 160,000 |            | 160,000   |
| (FO) | <i>Big Hill Reservoir</i>                                                                 | 4,100,000   | 35,000      | 100,000 | 100,000 |            | 100,000   |
| (FO) | <i>Cedar Point Reservoir</i>                                                              | 6,570,000   | 15,000      |         |         |            | 50,000    |
| (FO) | <i>Clinton Reservoir</i>                                                                  | 29,700,000  | 60,000      | 240,000 | 240,000 |            | 240,000   |
| (FO) | <b>Council Grove Reservoir</b>                                                            | 11,200,000  | 10,512,000  |         |         | 688,000    |           |
| (FO) | Elk City Reservoir                                                                        | 22,800,000  | 7,998,000   |         |         | 7,500,000  |           |
| (FO) | <i>Fort Scott Reservoir</i>                                                               | 19,900,000  | 40,000      |         |         |            | 100,000   |
| (FO) | <b>John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir</b>                                                    | 28,500,000  | 27,212,000  |         |         | 1,288,000  |           |
| (FO) | <i>Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)</i>                                             | 19,900,000  |             | 100,000 | 100,000 |            | 100,000   |
| (FO) | <i>Lawrence</i>                                                                           | 5,000,000   | 143,000     |         |         | 300,000    |           |
| (FO) | Marion Reservoir                                                                          | 14,600,000  | 1,257,000   |         |         | 2,700,000  |           |
| (FO) |                                                                                           |             |             |         |         |            | 3,000,000 |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                                                                     | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                                                     |                                           |                                          | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| Kansas—Continued                                                                                                    |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| <i>Marysville</i> .....                                                                                             | \$820,000                                 | \$38,000                                 |                                                  |                 | \$200,000           | \$230,000       | \$200,000                          | \$230,000       |
| <i>Matern Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                       | 24,400,000                                | 470,000                                  |                                                  |                 |                     | 40,000          |                                    | 40,000          |
| <i>Merriam</i> .....                                                                                                | 1,020,000                                 | 60,000                                   |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| <i>Millford Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                     | 61,200,000                                | 27,354,000                               | \$16,000,000                                     |                 | 16,000,000          |                 | 16,000,000                         |                 |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                               |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                             |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Perry Reservoir.....                                                                                                | 47,700,000                                | 3,654,000                                | 8,500,000                                        |                 | 6,500,000           |                 | 8,500,000                          |                 |
| Topeka.....                                                                                                         | 22,400,000                                | 13,476,000                               | 4,500,000                                        |                 | 4,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000                          |                 |
| Wilson Reservoir.....                                                                                               | 21,200,000                                | 16,777,000                               | 2,900,000                                        |                 | 2,900,000           |                 | 3,000,000                          |                 |
| Kentucky:                                                                                                           |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.                                                                                          | 145,000,000                               | 119,310,000                              | 15,400,000                                       |                 | 15,400,000          |                 | 15,400,000                         | 25,000          |
| <i>Bellvue (deferred) and Dayton (inactive)</i>                                                                     | 5,270,000                                 |                                          |                                                  | 100,000         |                     |                 |                                    | 100,000         |
| <i>Booneville Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                   | 22,400,000                                |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                       |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio.                                                           |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| <i>Carr Fork Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                    | 72,200,000                                | 65,855,000                               | *6,365,000                                       |                 | 6,365,000           |                 | 6,365,000                          |                 |
| <i>Cane Run Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                     | 11,200,000                                | 250,000                                  | **830,000                                        | **0             | 830,000             |                 | 830,000                            |                 |
| Cumberland.....                                                                                                     | 25,400,000                                | 325,000                                  | 1,300,000                                        |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000                          |                 |
| Eagle Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                          | 530,000                                   | 40,000                                   | 490,000                                          |                 | 490,000             |                 | 490,000                            |                 |
| Fishtrap Reservoir.....                                                                                             | 11,100,000                                | 100,000                                  |                                                  | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                                    | 150,000         |
| Frankfort.....                                                                                                      | 55,900,000                                | 17,715,000                               | 10,400,000                                       |                 | 18,000,000          |                 | 18,000,000                         |                 |
| Grayson Reservoir.....                                                                                              | 1,280,000                                 |                                          |                                                  | 130,000         |                     | 130,000         |                                    | 130,000         |
| Green River Reservoir.....                                                                                          | 18,200,000                                | 1,192,000                                | 4,200,000                                        |                 | 4,200,000           |                 | 4,200,000                          |                 |
| <i>Laurel River Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                 | 28,700,000                                | 2,071,000                                | **4,000,000                                      |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000                          |                 |
| McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville) Indiana and Kentucky.                                                           | 22,700,000                                | 853,000                                  |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 500,000                            |                 |
| <i>Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)</i>                                                 | 54,300,000                                | 41,730,000                               | 2,800,000                                        |                 | 2,800,000           |                 | 2,800,000                          |                 |
| <i>Red River Reservoir</i> .....                                                                                    |                                           |                                          |                                                  | **150,000       |                     |                 |                                    | 150,000         |
| <i>Sturgis</i> .....                                                                                                | 9,720,000                                 | 50,000                                   |                                                  |                 |                     | 75,000          |                                    | 75,000          |
| Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                       | 1,680,000                                 |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Louisiana:                                                                                                          |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas | 6,701,000                                 | 4,010,000                                | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000                          |                 |

|      |                                                                                                          |             |             |           |           |           |               |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| (N)  | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Waterway                                                              | 4,680,000   | 646,000     | 800,000   | 800,000   | 800,000   | 800,000       |
| (N)  | Calcasieu River and Pass                                                                                 | 19,200,000  | 5,618,000   | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 5,000,000     |
| (N)  | Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier                                                                       | 3,340,000   | 156,000     | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000     |
| (FC) | Campiti Clarence levee                                                                                   | 1,320,000   | 178,000     | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000       |
| (FC) | <i>Comite (small flood control, sec. 206)</i>                                                            | (4)         |             |           |           |           | 4 (1,000,000) |
| (FC) | <i>East Point levee</i>                                                                                  | (4)         |             |           |           |           | (4)           |
| (N)  | Freshwater Bayou                                                                                         | 7,700,000   | 1,289,000   | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000     |
| (N)  | Mississippi River, gulf outlet                                                                           | 95,000,000  | 43,673,000  | 8,750,000 | 8,750,000 | 8,750,000 | 9,250,000     |
| (FC) | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)                                                    | 7,580,000   | 225,000     | 750,000   | 750,000   | 750,000   | 750,000       |
| (FC) | Ouchita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)                                                   |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (FC) | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)           |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Maine:                                                                                                   |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel                                                                         | 8,100,000   | 1,110,000   | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | 1,850,000     |
| (N)  | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)                              |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Maryland:                                                                                                |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (FC) | Baltimore Harbor and Channel                                                                             | 28,000,000  | 13,321,000  | 3,300,000 | 3,300,000 | 3,300,000 | 3,500,000     |
| (FC) | <i>Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.</i>                                                             | 51,000,000  | 100,000     |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.) |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Massachusetts:                                                                                           |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | <i>Boston Harbor, Chelsea River</i>                                                                      | 2,570,000   | 40,000      | 550,000   | 550,000   | 550,000   | 550,000       |
| (R)  | Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge                                                                            | 1,300,000   | 438,000     | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000       |
| (FC) | Chicopee Falls                                                                                           | 2,290,000   | 1,670,000   | 620,000   | 620,000   | 620,000   | 620,000       |
| (FC) | Conant Brook Reservoir                                                                                   | 2,420,000   | 555,000     | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000     |
| (N)  | Gloucester Harbor                                                                                        | 1,130,000   | 300,000     | 830,000   | 830,000   | 830,000   | 830,000       |
| (FC) | Littleville Reservoir                                                                                    | 6,982,000   | 5,046,000   | 1,936,000 | 1,936,000 | 1,936,000 | 1,936,000     |
| (N)  | <i>Marblehead Harbor</i>                                                                                 | 1,822,000   |             |           |           |           |               |
| (FC) | New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier                                                               | 11,266,000  | 5,969,000   | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000     |
| (FC) | Three Rivers                                                                                             | 1,400,000   | 825,000     | 435,000   | 435,000   | 435,000   | 435,000       |
| (FC) | <i>Wareham-Marion</i>                                                                                    | 3,812,000   | 165,000     |           |           |           |               |
| (FC) | <i>Westfield</i>                                                                                         | 4,800,000   | 284,000     | 300,000   | 300,000   | 300,000   | 300,000       |
| (N)  | Michigan:                                                                                                |             |             |           |           |           |               |
| (R)  | <i>Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)</i>                                                          | 1,200,000   | 30,000      | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000       |
| (N)  | Gladstone Harbor                                                                                         | 812,000     | 195,000     | 617,000   | 617,000   | 617,000   | 617,000       |
| (N)  | Great Lakes connecting channels                                                                          | 125,500,000 | 117,535,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000     |
| (N)  | <i>Leland Harbor</i>                                                                                     | 530,000     |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | Ludington Harbor (north revetment)                                                                       | 346,000     | 174,000     | 172,000   | 172,000   | 172,000   | 172,000       |
| (R)  | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)                                                                     | 1,400,000   | 345,000     | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000       |
| (R)  | <i>Morquette Harbor</i>                                                                                  | 513,000     | 13,000      | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000       |
| (N)  | Muskegon Harbor                                                                                          | 660,000     | 100,000     | 560,000   | 560,000   | 560,000   | 560,000       |
| (R)  | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)                                                     | 1,150,000   | 30,000      | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000   | 150,000       |
| (N)  | <i>New Buffalo Harbor</i>                                                                                | 1,705,000   |             |           |           |           |               |
| (N)  | <i>Ontonagon Harbor</i>                                                                                  | 5,570,000   |             |           |           |           |               |
| (FC) | <i>Rouge River</i>                                                                                       | 9,620,000   | 262,000     | 91,000    | 91,000    | 91,000    | 91,000        |
| (N)  | St. Marys River: New Poc lock                                                                            | 40,300,000  | 7,817,000   | 5,500,000 | 5,500,000 | 5,500,000 | 5,500,000     |
| (FC) | Saginaw River (flood control)                                                                            | 19,600,000  | 1,011,000   | 750,000   | 750,000   | 750,000   | 750,000       |
| (N)  | <i>Saginaw River (navigation)</i>                                                                        | 5,040,000   |             | 120,000   | 120,000   | 120,000   | 120,000       |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                                                               | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                                               |                                           |                                          | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| Minnesota:                                                                                                    |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (N) Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: Inner harbor,<br>27- and 23-foot channels.                        | \$3, 400, 000                             | \$1, 277, 000                            | \$675, 000                                       | -----           | \$675, 000          | -----           | \$675, 000                         | -----           |
| (FC) Lost River                                                                                               | 520, 000                                  | 270, 000                                 | 250, 000                                         | -----           | 250, 000            | -----           | 250, 000                           | -----           |
| (N) Minnesota River, 9-foot channel.                                                                          | 2, 580, 000                               | 347, 000                                 | 1, 000, 000                                      | -----           | 1, 000, 000         | -----           | 1, 000, 000                        | -----           |
| (R) Reservoirs at headquarters of Mississippi River, Winni-<br>bigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls). | 465, 000                                  | 230, 000                                 | 235, 000                                         | -----           | 235, 000            | -----           | 235, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) Rushford                                                                                                 | 1, 490, 000                               | 77, 000                                  | -----                                            | \$80, 000       | -----               | -----           | -----                              | \$80, 000       |
| (FC) St. Paul and South St. Paul                                                                              | 7, 560, 000                               | 3, 316, 000                              | 600, 000                                         | -----           | 600, 000            | -----           | 600, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) Winona                                                                                                   | 1, 980, 000                               | 402, 000                                 | 800, 000                                         | -----           | 800, 000            | -----           | 800, 000                           | -----           |
| Mississippi:                                                                                                  |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                       |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (FC) Jackson and East Jackson                                                                                 | 5, 110, 000                               | 1, 125, 000                              | -----                                            | -----           | 800, 000            | -----           | 800, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) Okatibbee Creek Reservoir                                                                                | 6, 740, 000                               | 250, 000                                 | 500, 000                                         | -----           | 500, 000            | -----           | 500, 000                           | -----           |
| (N) Pascagoula Harbor                                                                                         | 3, 520, 000                               | 2, 900, 000                              | 620, 000                                         | -----           | 620, 000            | -----           | 620, 000                           | -----           |
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See<br>Alabama.)                                                |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (N) Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi.                                                 | 24, 000, 000                              | 161, 000                                 | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | -----           | 400, 000                           | -----           |
| Missouri:                                                                                                     |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (FC) Chariton River                                                                                           | 8, 200, 000                               | 1, 373, 000                              | 650, 000                                         | -----           | 650, 000            | -----           | 650, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) Hannibal                                                                                                 | 4, 570, 000                               | 1, 175, 000                              | -----                                            | 155, 000        | -----               | 155, 000        | -----                              | 155, 000        |
| (MP) Joanna Reservoir                                                                                         | 68, 300, 000                              | 766, 000                                 | -----                                            | 434, 000        | -----               | 434, 000        | -----                              | 434, 000        |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir                                                                                | 146, 200, 000                             | 1, 803, 000                              | **1, 500, 000                                    | -----           | 1, 500, 000         | -----           | 1, 500, 000                        | -----           |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction.                                                         | 3, 300, 000                               | 1, 032, 000                              | 1, 000, 000                                      | -----           | 1, 000, 000         | -----           | 1, 000, 000                        | -----           |
| (FC) Marion County Drainage District                                                                          | 1, 060, 000                               | 296, 000                                 | 764, 000                                         | -----           | 764, 000            | -----           | 764, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) Meramec Park Reservoir                                                                                   | 36, 100, 000                              | -----                                    | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | -----           | -----                              | 200, 000        |
| Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill.<br>and Mo. (See Illinois.)                           |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri,<br>and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                       |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas,<br>Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                    |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts, 1 2, and 5.                                                   | 6, 930, 000                               | 6, 334, 000                              | 596, 000                                         | -----           | 596, 000            | -----           | 596, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) South River Drainage District                                                                            | 1, 170, 000                               | 671, 000                                 | 499, 000                                         | -----           | 499, 000            | -----           | 499, 000                           | -----           |
| (FC) St. Louis                                                                                                | 85, 600, 000                              | 34, 710, 000                             | 10, 000, 000                                     | -----           | 10, 000, 000        | -----           | 10, 000, 000                       | -----           |
| (MP) Stockton Reservoir                                                                                       | 52, 200, 000                              | 4, 034, 000                              | 4, 000, 000                                      | -----           | 4, 000, 000         | -----           | 4, 000, 000                        | -----           |
| Montana:                                                                                                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| (FC) Billings (deferred)                                                                                      | 4, 590, 000                               | 50, 000                                  | -----                                            | 1, 000, 000     | -----               | 1, 000, 000     | -----                              | 25, 000         |
| (MP) Libby Reservoir                                                                                          | 332, 000, 000                             | 5, 718, 000                              | -----                                            | -----           | -----               | -----           | -----                              | 1, 000, 000     |



|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |            |             |             |           |           |           |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (FC)<br>(R)<br>(FC)  | Nebraska:<br>(Gering Valley<br>Hartman County Reservoir, slope protection<br><i>Little Papillion Creek</i><br>Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri,<br>and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)<br>Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Mis-<br>souri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)<br><i>Norfolk</i><br>Salt Creek and tributaries<br>Nevada:<br><i>Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.</i><br>New Hampshire:<br><i>Hampton Beach (1962 act) (reimbursement)</i><br>Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and<br>N.H. | 5,880,000  | 1,456,000   | 1,406,000   | 1,406,000 | 1,406,000 | 1,406,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1,000,000  | 130,000     | 1,600,000   | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 2,400,000  |             |             |           |           | 80,000    |
| (FC)<br>(FC)         | 2,680,000<br>15,200,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 130,000    | 300,000     | 300,000     | 300,000   | 300,000   | 300,000   |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 5,927,000  | 3,000,000   | 3,000,000   | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| (FC)                 | 2,840,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 100,000    |             | 125,000     | 125,000   | 125,000   | 200,000   |
| (FC)                 | 359,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |            |             |             |           |           | 109,000   |
| (N)                  | 8,500,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 840,000    | 1,500,000   | 1,500,000   | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| (R)<br>(N)           | New Jersey:<br>Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)<br>Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorage), Dela-<br>ware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania<br>Manasquan River (bulkheads)<br>Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach<br>Channel                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 910,000    | 422,000     | **488,000   | 488,000   | 488,000   | 488,000   |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 29,000,000 | 2,455,000   | 3,750,000   | 3,750,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 448,000    | 358,000     | 90,000      | 90,000    | 90,000    | 90,000    |
| (R)                  | 1,532,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 400,000    | 1,132,000   | 1,132,000   | 1,132,000 | 1,132,000 | 1,132,000 |
| (R)                  | 584,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 300,000    | 264,000     | 264,000     | 264,000   | 264,000   | 264,000   |
| (FC)                 | <sup>(9)</sup><br>5,352,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 680,000    | 1,100,000   | 1,100,000   | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 |
| (FC)                 | 95,000,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 240,000    |             | 450,000     | 450,000   | 450,000   | 450,000   |
| (MP)                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |            |             |             |           |           |           |
| (FC)<br>(FC)<br>(FC) | New Mexico:<br>Albuquerque<br><i>Cochiti Reservoir</i><br><i>Galisteo Reservoir</i><br><i>Las Cruces</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 15,000,000 | 547,000     | 500,000     | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000   |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 50,000,000 | 1,205,000   |             |           | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 16,700,000 | 576,000     |             |           | 2,300,000 | 2,300,000 |
| (FC)                 | 3,530,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 50,000     |             | 192,000     | 192,000   | 192,000   | 192,000   |
| (N)<br>(N)<br>(BE)   | New York:<br>Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Penn-<br>sylvania.)<br>Buffalo Harbor: Outer harbor (1962 modification)<br>Buttermilk Channel<br>Fire Island Inlet, Long Island<br><i>Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 3,270,000  | 225,000     | 1,406,000   | 1,406,000 | 1,406,000 | 1,406,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 2,300,000  | 600,000     | **1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 2,687,000  | 1,575,000   | 1,112,000   | 1,112,000 | 1,112,000 | 1,112,000 |
| (FC)                 | 10,700,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |            |             |             |           |           | 25,000    |
| (FC)                 | 32,100,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 1,720,000  | **1,900,000 | 1,900,000   | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 |
| (N)                  | 34,256,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 26,298,000 | 400,000     | 400,000     | 400,000   | 400,000   | 400,000   |
| (FC)                 | 26,300,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 17,665,000 | 3,200,000   | 3,200,000   | 3,200,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 |
| (FC)                 | 4,160,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 401,000    | 800,000     | 800,000     | 800,000   | 800,000   | 800,000   |
| (FC)                 | 2,200,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 513,000    | 500,000     | 500,000     | 500,000   | 500,000   | 500,000   |
| (FC)                 | 6,550,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 135,000    |             | 100,000     | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   |
| (R)                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 20,000     | 215,000     | 215,000     | 215,000   | 215,000   | 215,000   |
| (FC)<br>(FC)         | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island<br>dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)<br><i>Nichols</i><br><i>North Ellenville</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 1,110,000  | 50,000      | **35,000    | 35,000    | 35,000    | 35,000    |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1,580,000  |             |             |           |           | 50,000    |
|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |            |             |             |           |           |           |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project                                                   | (1) | Total estimated Federal cost | Amount appropriated to date | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |           | House allowance |           | Amount recommended by committee |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
|                                                                                            |     |                              |                             | Construction                                  | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  | Construction                    | Planning  |
| New York—Continued                                                                         |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (N) Oswego Harbor (1962 act).....                                                          |     | \$1,260,000                  | \$80,000                    | \$300,000                                     |           | \$300,000       |           | \$300,000                       |           |
| (F) Rosendale.....                                                                         |     | 2,410,000                    | 100,000                     |                                               | \$100,000 |                 | \$100,000 |                                 | \$100,000 |
| (F) Salamanca.....                                                                         |     | 1,520,000                    | 20,000                      |                                               | 75,000    |                 | 75,000    |                                 | 75,000    |
| (F) South Amsterdam.....                                                                   |     | 1,560,000                    | 1,182,000                   | \$378,000                                     |           | 378,000         |           | 378,000                         |           |
| North Carolina:                                                                            |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (F) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (F) Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection.....                                        |     | 1,209,000                    | 80,000                      | 300,000                                       |           | 300,000         |           | 678,000                         |           |
| (N) Masonboro Inlet Jetty.....                                                             |     | 2,240,000                    | 487,000                     |                                               |           |                 |           | 150,000                         |           |
| (F) New Hope Reservoir.....                                                                |     | 25,462,000                   | 280,000                     |                                               | 250,000   |                 | 250,000   |                                 | 250,000   |
| (N) Northeast Cape Fear (sec. 107).....                                                    |     |                              |                             |                                               |           | \$ (105,200)    |           | \$ (105,200)                    |           |
| (N) Wilmington Harbor, 88- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)                                    |     | 6,400,000                    | 135,000                     |                                               | 67,000    |                 | 67,000    |                                 | 500,000   |
| (N) Wrightsville Beach.....                                                                |     | 577,000                      | 36,000                      |                                               |           |                 |           | 541,000                         |           |
| North Dakota:                                                                              |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (F) Bowman Haley Reservoir.....                                                            |     | 3,180,000                    | 385,000                     | 800,000                                       |           | 800,000         |           | 1,200,000                       |           |
| (F) Missouri River Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir.....                                     |     | 3,000,000                    | 220,000                     | 800,000                                       |           | 800,000         |           | 800,000                         |           |
| (F) Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)                                |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (F) Velva.....                                                                             |     | 214,000                      |                             |                                               |           |                 |           | \$ (214,000)                    |           |
| Ohio:                                                                                      |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (N) Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                  |     | 64,800,000                   | 18,632,000                  | 16,500,000                                    |           | 16,500,000      |           | 16,500,000                      |           |
| (F) Big Darby Creek Reservoir.....                                                         |     | 27,200,000                   | 516,000                     | **1,000,000                                   |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000                       |           |
| (F) Buck Creek Reservoir.....                                                              |     | 9,030,000                    | 223,000                     |                                               | 77,000    | 730,000         |           | 730,000                         |           |
| (F) Caesar Creek Reservoir.....                                                            |     | 14,700,000                   | 88,000                      |                                               | **150,000 |                 | 150,000   |                                 | 150,000   |
| Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)                    |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 |           |                                 |           |
| (N) Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)..... |     | 14,100,000                   | 1,634,000                   | 1,800,000                                     |           | 1,800,000       |           | 1,800,000                       |           |
| (N) Cleveland Harbor, deepen east basin to 27 to 28 feet (1962 act)                        |     | 1,580,000                    | 27,000                      |                                               |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000                         |           |
| (N) Conneaut Harbor.....                                                                   |     | 9,120,000                    | 200,000                     | 1,000,000                                     |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000                       |           |
| (F) Deer Creek Reservoir.....                                                              |     | 16,800,000                   | 456,000                     |                                               |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000                         |           |
| (F) East Fork Reservoir.....                                                               |     | 17,600,000                   | 147,000                     |                                               | **150,000 |                 | 150,000   |                                 | 150,000   |
| (F) Empire (deferred).....                                                                 |     |                              |                             |                                               |           |                 | 25,000    |                                 | 25,000    |
| (F) Fremont.....                                                                           |     | 4,650,000                    | 100,000                     |                                               | 130,000   |                 | 130,000   |                                 | 130,000   |
| (N) Hamilton locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                    |     | 59,700,000                   | 350,000                     |                                               | 230,000   |                 | 230,000   |                                 | 230,000   |
| (N) Lorain Harbor.....                                                                     |     | 16,300,000                   | 6,872,000                   | 3,000,000                                     |           | 3,000,000       |           | 3,000,000                       |           |
| (F) North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir.....                                             |     | 3,030,000                    | 75,000                      |                                               | 99,000    |                 | 99,000    |                                 | 99,000    |
| (F) Point Creek Reservoir.....                                                             |     | 22,500,000                   | 360,000                     |                                               | 116,000   |                 | 116,000   |                                 | 116,000   |
| (N) Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                 |     | 56,200,000                   | 48,561,000                  | 7,539,000                                     |           | 7,539,000       |           | 7,539,000                       |           |
| (N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                      |     | 79,800,000                   | 1,666,000                   | 6,200,000                                     |           | 6,200,000       |           | 6,200,000                       |           |
| (F) Salt Creek Reservoir.....                                                              |     | 14,200,000                   | 100,000                     |                                               | **200,000 |                 | 200,000   |                                 | 200,000   |

|      |                                                                                             |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
| (FC) | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)                                  | 12,100,000  | 5,823,000   | 4,100,000    | 325,000   | 4,100,000  | 325,000   | 4,100,000        | 325,000 |
| (N)  | West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River.                                                      | 70,300,000  | 150,000     |              | 25,000    |            | 25,000    |                  | 25,000  |
| (FC) | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.                                         | 2,460,000   | 50,000      |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
|      | Youngstown, Crab Creek.                                                                     |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
|      | Oklahoma:                                                                                   |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
|      | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.                                      |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
|      | (See Arkansas.)                                                                             |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
| (FC) | Birch Reservoir.                                                                            | 3,500,000   | 145,000     |              | 155,000   |            | 155,000   |                  | 155,000 |
| (MP) | Broken Bow Reservoir.                                                                       | 39,600,000  | 7,116,000   | 4,800,000    |           | 4,800,000  |           | 4,800,000        |         |
| (FC) | Copan Reservoir.                                                                            | 26,500,000  | 100,000     |              | 150,000   |            | 150,000   |                  | 150,000 |
| (MP) | Eufaula Reservoir.                                                                          | 119,616,000 | 116,616,000 | 3,000,000    |           | 3,000,000  |           | 3,000,000        |         |
| (FC) | Hugo Reservoir.                                                                             | 22,600,000  | 190,000     |              | 150,000   |            | 150,000   |                  | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Kaw Reservoir.                                                                              | 86,600,000  | 275,000     |              | 200,000   |            | 200,000   |                  | 200,000 |
| (MP) | Keystone Reservoir.                                                                         | 127,377,000 | 102,377,000 | 6,000,000    |           | 6,000,000  |           | 6,000,000        |         |
| (FC) | Luskata Reservoir.                                                                          | 12,500,000  | 45,000      |              | ***25,000 |            | ***25,000 |                  | 25,000  |
| (FC) | Optima Reservoir.                                                                           | 21,100,000  | 463,000     |              | 162,000   |            | 162,000   |                  | 162,000 |
| (FC) | Pine Creek Reservoir.                                                                       | 21,200,000  | 2,384,000   | 3,500,000    |           | 3,500,000  |           | 3,500,000        |         |
| (MP) | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam.                                               | 108,000,000 | 3,181,000   | ***9,000,000 |           | 6,000,000  |           | 9,000,000        | 225,000 |
| (FC) | Skiatook Reservoir.                                                                         | 23,700,000  | 40,000      |              | 225,000   |            | 225,000   |                  | 225,000 |
| (N)  | Webbers Falls lock and dam.                                                                 | 63,200,000  | 772,000     | ***2,500,000 |           | 1,000,000  |           | 2,500,000        |         |
|      | Oregon:                                                                                     |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
| (FC) | Applegate Reservoir.                                                                        | 15,800,000  |             |              |           |            | 150,000   | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Bear Creek.                                                                                 | 31,300,000  |             |              |           |            |           | 2,023,000        |         |
| (FC) | Blue River Reservoir.                                                                       | 21,700,000  | 2,094,000   | 2,028,000    |           | 2,028,000  |           |                  |         |
| (N)  | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. | 11,300,000  | 814,000     | 2,000,000    |           | 2,000,000  |           | 2,500,000        | 130,000 |
| (N)  | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.                                         |             | 888,000     |              |           |            | 130,000   |                  |         |
| (R)  | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington.                           |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
| (N)  | Coos and Millicoma Rivers.                                                                  | 9,400,000   | 2,392,000   | 1,500,000    |           | 1,500,000  |           | 1,500,000        |         |
| (MP) | Cougar Reservoir.                                                                           | 578,000     | 23,000      | 555,000      |           | 555,000    |           | 555,000          |         |
| (FC) | Elk Creek Reservoir.                                                                        | 54,700,000  | 52,261,000  | 585,000      |           | 585,000    |           | 585,000          |         |
| (FC) | Fall Creek Reservoir.                                                                       | 18,700,000  |             |              |           |            |           |                  | 130,000 |
| (FC) | Green Peter Reservoir.                                                                      | 27,800,000  | 5,767,000   | 8,500,000    |           | 8,500,000  |           | 8,500,000        |         |
| (MP) | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.                                               | 79,900,000  | 25,311,000  | 19,500,000   |           | 19,500,000 |           | 19,500,000       |         |
| (MP) | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.                                               | 414,000,000 | 168,740,000 | 72,000,000   |           | 72,000,000 |           | 72,000,000       |         |
| (MP) | Lost Creek Reservoir.                                                                       | 79,000,000  | 100,000     |              | 350,000   |            | 350,000   |                  | 350,000 |
| (FC) | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington.                                |             |             |              |           |            |           |                  |         |
| (FC) | Shelton Ditch.                                                                              | 9,000,000   | 1,626,000   | 500,000      |           | 500,000    |           | 500,000          |         |
| (FC) | Tillamook Bay and Harbor.                                                                   | 1,950,000   | 10,000      |              |           |            | 100,000   |                  | 100,000 |
| (R)  | Willamette River Basin bank protection.                                                     | 2,030,000   | 1,530,000   | 500,000      |           | 500,000    |           | 500,000          |         |
| (FC) | Yacquina Bay and Harbor.                                                                    | 12,800,000  | 10,025,000  | 500,000      |           | 500,000    |           | 500,000          |         |
| (N)  | Pennsylvania:                                                                               | 18,300,000  | 1,740,000   | 1,700,000    |           | 1,700,000  |           | 1,700,000        |         |
| (FC) | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.                                                     | 107,000,000 | 63,906,000  | 27,000,000   |           | 27,000,000 |           | 27,000,000       |         |
| (FC) | Aylesworth Creek Reservoir.                                                                 | 1,230,000   |             |              | 80,000    |            | 80,000    |                  | 80,000  |
| (FC) | Beltzville Reservoir.                                                                       | 14,500,000  | 349,000     |              | 276,000   |            | 276,000   |                  | 276,000 |
| (FC) | Blanchard Reservoir.                                                                        | 28,900,000  | 996,000     |              |           |            |           | 1,000,000        |         |
| (FC) | Blue Marsh Reservoir.                                                                       | 13,200,000  |             |              | 100,000   |            | 100,000   |                  | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Butler.                                                                                     | 1,820,000   | 1,058,000   | 762,000      |           | 762,000    |           | 762,000          |         |
| (N)  | Curwensville Reservoir.                                                                     | 19,600,000  | 13,677,000  | *3,200,000   |           | 3,200,000  |           | 3,200,000        |         |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                         | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |            | House allowance |          | Amount recommended<br>by committee |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|
|                                                                                                                  |                                    |                                   | Construction                                     | Planning   | Construction    | Planning | Construction                       | Planning |
| (1)                                                                                                              | (2)                                | (3)                               | (4)                                              | (5)        | (6)             | (7)      | (8)                                | (9)      |
| Pennsylvania—Continued                                                                                           |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| (FC) Dam 4, Monongahela River.....                                                                               | \$13,400,000                       | \$3,082,000                       | \$3,800,000                                      | -----      | \$3,800,000     | -----    | \$3,800,000                        | -----    |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anelorrages, Dela-<br>ware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) |                                    |                                   |                                                  | -----      |                 | -----    |                                    | -----    |
| (FC) Elkland.....                                                                                                | 1,670,000                          | 291,000                           | 800,000                                          | -----      | 800,000         | -----    | 800,000                            | \$25,000 |
| (N) Erie Harbor (1962 Mod.).....                                                                                 | 750,000                            | 192,000                           | 300,000                                          | -----      | 300,000         | -----    | 300,000                            | -----    |
| (FC) Latrobe.....                                                                                                | 3,103,000                          | 23,532,000                        | 5,500,000                                        | -----      | 5,500,000       | -----    | 5,500,000                          | -----    |
| (N) Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River.....                                                                | 31,000,000                         |                                   |                                                  | -----      |                 | -----    |                                    | -----    |
| (FC) Muddy Creek Reservoir, Pa.....                                                                              | 7,780,000                          |                                   |                                                  | **\$25,000 |                 | -----    |                                    | 25,000   |
| (FC) Raysdown Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 32,150,000                         | 150,000                           |                                                  | **700,000  |                 | -----    |                                    | 700,000  |
| (FC) Scranton.....                                                                                               | 1,910,000                          | 100,000                           | -----                                            | 45,000     | -----           | -----    | -----                              | 45,000   |
| (FC) Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.....                                                                  | 34,800,000                         | 20,387,000                        | 11,300,000                                       | -----      | 11,300,000      | -----    | 11,300,000                         | -----    |
| (FC) Tioga Hammond Reservoir.....                                                                                | 53,600,000                         | -----                             | -----                                            | **300,000  | -----           | -----    | 300,000                            | 300,000  |
| Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N. J. (See New Jersey.)                                                          |                                    |                                   |                                                  | -----      |                 | -----    |                                    | -----    |
| (FC) Turtle Creek.....                                                                                           | 14,600,000                         | 3,547,000                         | **4,500,000                                      | -----      | 4,500,000       | -----    | 4,500,000                          | -----    |
| (FC) Union City Reservoir.....                                                                                   | 9,400,000                          | 200,000                           | -----                                            | 100,000    | -----           | -----    | 100,000                            | 100,000  |
| (FC) Woodcock Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 8,100,000                          | -----                             | -----                                            | 60,000     | -----           | -----    | 60,000                             | 60,000   |
| Rhode Island:                                                                                                    |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| (FC) Fox Point Barrier.....                                                                                      | 10,990,000                         | 9,133,000                         | 1,857,000                                        | -----      | 1,857,000       | -----    | 1,857,000                          | -----    |
| (FC) Lower Woonsocket.....                                                                                       | 6,838,000                          | 1,314,000                         | 2,000,000                                        | -----      | 2,000,000       | -----    | 2,000,000                          | -----    |
| (FC) Narragansett pier, hurricane barrier.....                                                                   | 1,407,000                          | 50,000                            | -----                                            | 65,000     | -----           | -----    | 65,000                             | 65,000   |
| (FC) Point Judith, hurricane barrier.....                                                                        | 2,622,000                          | 50,000                            | -----                                            | 100,000    | -----           | -----    | 120,000                            | 120,000  |
| (N) Warwick Cone (sec. 107).....                                                                                 | -----                              | -----                             | -----                                            | -----      | 3 (200,000)     | -----    | 3 (200,000)                        | -----    |
| South Carolina:                                                                                                  |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                          |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| South Dakota:                                                                                                    |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| (MP) Big Bend Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 107,000,000                        | 77,275,000                        | 14,500,000                                       | -----      | 14,500,000      | -----    | 14,500,000                         | -----    |
| (MP) Fort Randall Reservoir.....                                                                                 | 195,600,000                        | 193,792,000                       | 1,270,000                                        | -----      | 1,270,000       | -----    | 1,270,000                          | -----    |
| (MP) Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.....                                                                     | 340,000,000                        | 317,193,000                       | 4,000,000                                        | -----      | 4,000,000       | -----    | 4,000,000                          | -----    |
| Tennessee:                                                                                                       |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| (MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)                                                                  |                                    |                                   |                                                  | -----      |                 | -----    |                                    | -----    |
| (MP) Cordell Hull lock and dam.....                                                                              | 52,500,000                         | 3,757,000                         | 7,100,000                                        | -----      | 8,100,000       | -----    | 8,100,000                          | -----    |
| (MP) J. Percy Priest Reservoir.....                                                                              | 43,500,000                         | 6,287,000                         | **12,100,000                                     | -----      | 10,100,000      | -----    | 12,100,000                         | -----    |
| (BA) Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.....                                                                | 863,000                            | 450,000                           | 413,000                                          | -----      | 413,000         | -----    | 413,000                            | -----    |
| Texas:                                                                                                           |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                          |                                    |                                   |                                                  |            |                 |          |                                    |          |
| (FC) Bardwell Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 13,000,000                         | 3,638,000                         | 6,500,000                                        | -----      | 6,500,000       | -----    | 6,500,000                          | -----    |
| (FC) Big Fossil Creek.....                                                                                       | 1,970,000                          | 630,000                           | 1,340,000                                        | -----      | 1,340,000       | -----    | 1,340,000                          | -----    |
| (R) Brazos Island Harbor (jetty).....                                                                            | 2,000,000                          | 400,000                           | 750,000                                          | -----      | 750,000         | -----    | 750,000                            | -----    |
| (FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries.....                                                                          | 55,800,000                         | 33,508,000                        | 2,900,000                                        | -----      | 2,900,000       | -----    | 2,900,000                          | -----    |

|      |                                                                                                           |             |            |            |            |            |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| (FC) | Canyon Reservoir                                                                                          | 17,500,000  | 16,886,000 | 614,000    | 614,000    | 614,000    |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension                                                                 | 5,420,000   | 212,000    | 200,000    | 200,000    | 200,000    |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension                                                                  | 2,369,000   | 445,000    | 600,000    | 600,000    | 600,000    |
| (FC) | Freeport and vicinity                                                                                     | 3,850,000   | 60,000     | 300,000    | 300,000    | 300,000    |
| (L)  | Galveston Harbor (jetties)                                                                                | 11,100,000  | 3,125,000  | 1,800,000  | 1,800,000  | 1,800,000  |
| (N)  | Gabrielon Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project                                                             | 2,840,000   |            | 500,000    | 500,000    | 500,000    |
| (N)  | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River Channel to Victoria                                           | 8,500,000   | 5,545,000  | 2,955,000  | 2,955,000  | 2,955,000  |
| (N)  | Houston ship channel (40-foot project)                                                                    | 16,000,000  | 10,497,000 | 3,200,000  | 3,200,000  | 3,200,000  |
| (FC) | Lake Kemp Reservoir                                                                                       | 8,600,000   | 50,000     | 200,000    | 200,000    | 200,000    |
| (FC) | Laron Reservoir modification and channel improvement                                                      | 25,900,000  | 150,000    | 225,000    | 225,000    | 225,000    |
| (N)  | Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels                                                          | 15,100,000  | 11,323,000 | 2,477,000  | 2,477,000  | 2,477,000  |
| (FC) | Pat Mayse Reservoir                                                                                       | 8,100,000   | 100,000    | 300,000    | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  |
| (N)  | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola                           | 5,600,000   | 1,525,000  | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  |
| (R)  | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)                                                            | 4,500,000   | 450,000    | 800,000    | 800,000    | 800,000    |
| (FC) | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)                                                     | 23,500,000  | 415,000    |            |            |            |
| (FC) | Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., Ia., and Tex. (See Arkansas)            |             |            | 389,000    | 389,000    | 389,000    |
| (N)  | Sabine-Neches Waterway 40-foot and channel to Echo                                                        | 20,900,000  | 350,000    |            |            |            |
| (MT) | San Antonio Channel                                                                                       | 58,000,000  | 48,627,000 | 5,600,000  | 5,600,000  | 5,600,000  |
| (FC) | San Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam                                                                              | 21,200,000  | 6,803,000  | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  |
| (FC) | San Gabriel River Tributary to Brazos River                                                               | 48,100,000  |            | 400,000    | 400,000    | 400,000    |
| (FC) | Somerville Reservoir                                                                                      | 18,800,000  | 8,308,000  | 5,200,000  | 5,200,000  | 5,200,000  |
| (FC) | Stillhouse Hollow Dam                                                                                     | 20,600,000  | 5,308,000  | 3,600,000  | 3,600,000  | 3,600,000  |
| (FC) | Texas City                                                                                                | 15,700,000  | 3,983,000  | 4,300,000  | 4,300,000  | 4,300,000  |
| (FC) | Vince and Little Vince Bayous                                                                             | 2,295,000   | 80,000     | 99,000     | 99,000     | 99,000     |
| (FC) | Waco Reservoir                                                                                            | 48,550,000  | 42,224,000 | 6,326,000  | 6,326,000  | 6,326,000  |
| (N)  | Wallisville Reservoir                                                                                     | 9,320,000   | 200,000    | 350,000    | 350,000    | 350,000    |
| (FC) | Vermont: Gaisville Dam (deferred)                                                                         |             |            |            |            |            |
| (FC) | Virginia: Gadsbight Reservoir                                                                             | 35,200,000  | 141,000    |            |            |            |
| (MP) | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir                                                                       | 20,600,000  | 13,405,000 | 5,000,000  | 5,000,000  | 5,000,000  |
| (FC) | Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay                                                                                   | 1,130,000   |            | 200,000    | 200,000    | 200,000    |
| (N)  | Norfolk                                                                                                   | 1,741,000   | 281,000    | 1,460,000  | 1,460,000  | 1,460,000  |
| (FC) | North Fork of Pound Reservoir                                                                             | 6,550,000   | 2,672,000  | 3,000,000  | 3,000,000  | 3,000,000  |
| (BE) | Virginia Beach (reimbursement)                                                                            | 740,000     |            | 125,000    | 125,000    | 125,000    |
| (FC) | Washington: Colfax                                                                                        | 5,260,000   | 2,746,000  | 1,500,000  | 1,500,000  | 1,500,000  |
| (FC) | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                         |             |            |            |            |            |
| (FC) | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) |             |            |            |            |            |
| (FC) | Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2                                         | 1,520,000   | 89,000     | 500,000    | 500,000    | 500,000    |
| (R)  | Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)                                                             | 4,770,000   |            |            |            |            |
| (N)  | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                               |             |            |            |            |            |
| (N)  | Kingston Harbor                                                                                           | 460,000     |            |            |            |            |
| (MP) | Little Goose lock and dam                                                                                 | 150,600,000 | 10,655,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 |

See footnotes at end of table, pp. 21-22.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                            | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br>(2) | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br>(3) | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                            |                                           |                                          | Construction<br>(4)                              | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                | Planning<br>(9) |
| Washington—Continued                                                       |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Lower Granite lock and dam.                                                | \$174,000,000                             | \$2,180,000                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | \$1,000,000                        |                 |
| Lower Monumental lock and dam.                                             | 176,000,000                               | 51,024,000                               | \$37,500,000                                     |                 | \$37,500,000        |                 | 37,500,000                         |                 |
| Samamish River.                                                            | 2,615,000                                 | 1,855,000                                | 760,000                                          |                 | 760,000             |                 | 760,000                            |                 |
| Swinomish Slough.                                                          | 910,000                                   | 120,000                                  | 790,000                                          |                 | 790,000             |                 | 790,000                            |                 |
| Tacoma Harbor.                                                             | 2,600,000                                 | 116,000                                  | 900,000                                          |                 | 900,000             |                 | 900,000                            |                 |
| Washougal area.                                                            | 1,410,000                                 | 141,000                                  | 700,000                                          |                 | 700,000             |                 | 700,000                            |                 |
| Wynoochee River Reservoir.                                                 | 14,100,000                                |                                          |                                                  | \$200,000       |                     | \$200,000       |                                    | \$200,000       |
| West Virginia:                                                             |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Beech Fork Reservoir                                                       | 11,700,000                                |                                          |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                                    | 150,000         |
| Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)              |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Birch Reservoir (deferred)                                                 | 6,450,000                                 |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    | 50,000          |
| Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)                      |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Buckhannon.                                                                | 1,330,000                                 | 103,000                                  | 175,000                                          |                 | 175,000             |                 | 175,000                            |                 |
| East Lynn Reservoir.                                                       | 14,300,000                                | 380,000                                  | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000                            |                 |
| Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Justice Reservoir                                                          | 64,000,000                                | 330,000                                  |                                                  | 650,000         | 4,800,000           | 650,000         | 4,800,000                          | 650,000         |
| Opekska lock and dam.                                                      | 23,400,000                                | 14,465,000                               | **4,800,000                                      |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)              |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                  |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Summersville Reservoir.                                                    | 44,500,000                                | 32,586,000                               | **8,244,000                                      |                 | 8,244,000           |                 | 9,000,000                          |                 |
| Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)            |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Wisconsin:                                                                 |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)                   |                                           |                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                                    |                 |
| Eau Claire River, Spring Valley.                                           | 8,250,000                                 | 1,048,000                                | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000                            |                 |
| Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)                                                | 4,500,000                                 | 50,000                                   |                                                  | 70,000          |                     | 70,000          |                                    | 70,000          |
| Kenosha Harbor.                                                            | 500,000                                   | 165,000                                  | 335,000                                          |                 | 335,000             |                 | 335,000                            |                 |
| Keweenaw Harbor (breakwater and retentment).                               | 1,000,000                                 | 30,000                                   | 150,000                                          |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000                            |                 |
| Kickapoo River.                                                            | 17,100,000                                | 50,000                                   |                                                  | 125,000         |                     | 125,000         |                                    | 125,000         |
| Milwaukee Harbor (1935 act).                                               | 132,000                                   | 7,000                                    | 6,000                                            |                 | 6,000               |                 | 6,000                              |                 |
| Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act).                                               | 4,430,000                                 | 40,000                                   | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000                            |                 |



|      |                                                                                                                 |             |             |                 |                 |                 |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (R)  | Millwaukee Harbor (breakwater)-----                                                                             | 1, 850, 000 | 1, 218, 000 | 432, 000        | 432, 000        | 432, 000        |
| (N)  | Suez Harbor-----                                                                                                | 550, 000    | 32, 000     | -----           | 200, 000        | 200, 000        |
| (R)  | Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan Ship canal-----                                                                      | 940, 000    | 793, 000    | 147, 000        | 147, 000        | 147, 000        |
|      | Miscellaneous:-----                                                                                             |             |             |                 |                 |                 |
| (FC) | Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)-----        |             |             |                 |                 |                 |
| (FC) | Snagging and clearing-----                                                                                      |             |             | 6, 000, 000     | 5, 000, 000     | 7, 758, 000     |
| (N)  | Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$200,000 (sec. 107)-----            |             |             | 250, 000        | 250, 000        | 250, 000        |
| (BE) | Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$400,000 (sec. 103)----- |             |             | 1, 500, 000     | * 1, 805, 200   | * 1, 949, 200   |
|      | Recreation facilities, completed projects-----                                                                  |             |             | 500, 000        | 500, 000        | 500, 000        |
|      | Small authorized projects-----                                                                                  |             |             | 4, 000, 000     | 4, 705, 000     | 5, 000, 000     |
|      | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)-----                                                 |             |             | 1, 000, 000     | 1, 000, 000     | 1, 000, 000     |
| (R)  | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to \$400,000)-----                                                    |             |             | 500, 000        | 500, 000        | 500, 000        |
|      | Employees compensation-----                                                                                     |             |             | 500, 000        | 500, 000        | 500, 000        |
|      | Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages-----                                                            |             |             | 176, 000        | 176, 000        | 176, 000        |
|      |                                                                                                                 |             |             | -70, 000, 000   | -75, 000, 000   | -70, 000, 000   |
|      | Grand total, construction, general-----                                                                         |             |             | 878, 939, 000   | 884, 006, 200   | 920, 327, 200   |
|      |                                                                                                                 |             |             | (899, 608, 000) | (905, 767, 200) | (942, 791, 200) |

\* Recommendations subsequently made to amend the budget as follows (H. Doc. 240; Mar. 9, 1964):

| State and project                                                     | From--      | To--          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Construction, general:                                                |             |               |
| Advance engineering and design, Washington: Pullman-----              | \$146, 000  | 0             |
| Construction:                                                         |             |               |
| Kentucky: Capt. Anthony Meldahl lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio.----- | 6, 885, 000 | \$6, 365, 000 |
| New York: South Amsterdam-----                                        | 512, 000    | 378, 000      |
| Total-----                                                            | 7, 543, 000 | 6, 743, 000   |

- <sup>1</sup> Contained in S. Doc. 77, 88th Cong., 2d sess.  
<sup>2</sup> Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small navigation projects (sec. 107) and included in tentative list for fiscal year 1965.  
<sup>3</sup> The additional funds allowed by the House were earmarked as follows:  
Northeast Cape Fear, N.C., \$105,200.  
Warwick Co., R.I., \$200,000.

- <sup>4</sup> Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects and included in tentative list of small authorized projects for fiscal year 1965.  
<sup>5</sup> Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small flood control projects (sec. 206), but not included in tentative list of projects for fiscal year 1965.

NOTE.—Projects shown in *italic* are new projects or modifications of projects on which construction has not started, and projects in **bold** face are those projects to be completed with the amount in the approved budget.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

\*\*Recommendations subsequently made to reprogram the budget amounts as follows:

| State and project                                                                               | Amount in budget | Revised amount | State and project                                                                     | Amount in budget | Revised amount |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| General investigations:                                                                         |                  |                | Construction, general—Continued                                                       |                  |                |
| Flood control studies:                                                                          |                  |                | Construction—Continued                                                                |                  |                |
| California: Sacramento-San Joaquin region.....                                                  | \$31,000         | \$20,000       | Kentucky:                                                                             |                  |                |
| Illinois: Saline River and tributaries.....                                                     | 40,000           | 65,000         | Carr Fork Reservoir.....                                                              | a (\$70,000)     | b \$830,000    |
| Indiana: Crooked Creek at and in vicinity of Madison.....                                       | 25,000           | 41,000         | Green River Reservoir.....                                                            | 3,200,000        | 4,000,000      |
| Kentucky: Salt River.....                                                                       | 40,000           | 65,000         | Missouri: Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir.....                                              | 1,078,000        | 1,500,000      |
| Utah: Price River.....                                                                          | 20,000           |                | New Jersey: Cold Spring Inlet (rehabilitation).....                                   |                  | 488,000        |
| Subtotal, general investigations.....                                                           | 156,000          | 191,000        | New York:                                                                             |                  |                |
| Construction, general:                                                                          |                  |                | Buttermilk Channel.....                                                               | 1,700,000        | 1,300,000      |
| Advance engineering and design:                                                                 |                  |                | Pine Island Inlet to Montauk Point.....                                               | 2,440,000        | 1,900,000      |
| Alabama: Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.....                                                      |                  |                | Ohio: Big Darby Reservoir.....                                                        | 750,000          | 1,000,000      |
| Illinois: Saline River and tributaries.....                                                     |                  |                | Oregon: John Day River.....                                                           | 400,000          |                |
| Kentucky:                                                                                       |                  |                | Pennsylvania:                                                                         |                  |                |
| Carr Fork Reservoir.....                                                                        | a 70,000         | b (\$30,000)   | Curwensville Reservoir.....                                                           | 3,000,000        | 3,200,000      |
| Red River Reservoir.....                                                                        | 100,000          | 150,000        | Turtle Creek.....                                                                     | 5,000,000        | 4,500,000      |
| New York: Nichols.....                                                                          |                  | 35,000         | West Virginia:                                                                        |                  |                |
| Ohio:                                                                                           |                  |                | Opekiska lock and dam.....                                                            | 5,200,000        | 4,800,000      |
| Caesar Creek Reservoir.....                                                                     | 100,000          | 150,000        | Summersville Reservoir.....                                                           | 7,914,000        | 8,244,000      |
| East Fork Reservoir.....                                                                        | 100,000          |                |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| Salt Creek Reservoir.....                                                                       | 100,000          | 200,000        | Subtotal, construction.....                                                           | 49,936,000       | 48,786,000     |
| Pennsylvania:                                                                                   |                  |                | Grand total, reprogramming.....                                                       | 50,862,000       | 50,862,000     |
| Muddy Creek Reservoir.....                                                                      |                  | 25,000         |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| Tioga-Hammond Reservoir.....                                                                    |                  | 300,000        |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| Raystown Reservoir.....                                                                         | 300,000          | 700,000        |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| Subtotal, advance engineering and design.....                                                   | 770,000          | 1,885,000      |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| Construction:                                                                                   |                  |                |                                                                                       |                  |                |
| California: Crescent City Harbor (rehabilitation).....                                          | 300,000          |                | State and project                                                                     | From—            | To—            |
| Florida: Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act).....                                                 | 2,254,000        | 1,254,000      | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: Navigation locks and dams..... | \$42,000,000     | \$51,500,000   |
| Illinois:                                                                                       |                  |                | Central and southern Florida flood control project.....                               | 13,800,000       | 13,800,000     |
| Calumet River bridges.....                                                                      | 2,000,000        | 1,300,000      | Perry Reservoir, Kans.....                                                            | 6,500,000        | 8,500,000      |
| Tri Pond levee.....                                                                             | 700,000          | 470,000        | Wareham-Marion, Mass.....                                                             | 100,000          | 75,000         |
| Indiana:                                                                                        |                  |                | Lakfata Reservoir, Okla.....                                                          |                  | 25,000         |
| Cannelton locks and dams, Indiana and Kentucky.....                                             | 12,000,000       | 11,600,000     | Robert S. Kerr lock and dam, Oklahoma.....                                            | 6,000,000        | 9,000,000      |
| Evansville.....                                                                                 | 700,000          | 900,000        | Webbers Falls lock and dam, Oklahoma.....                                             | 1,000,000        | 2,500,000      |
| Levee unit No. 5, Wabash River.....                                                             | 1,200,000        | 1,500,000      | J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn.....                                                  | 8,600,000        | 12,100,000     |
| Iowa: Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine Louisa County Drainage District No. 13..... | 100,000          |                |                                                                                       |                  |                |

\*\*\*Recommendations subsequently made as follows (S. Doe. 90, July 29, 1964):

a Planning funds to be taken out of budget.  
b All construction funds.

## CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, NORTH COVE, OLD SAYBROOK, CONN.

The committee has looked into the opposition voiced by certain groups to this project on the basis that it would adversely affect fish and wildlife resources of the area. The committee is informed that this project was authorized and justified on the basis of its need as a harbor of refuge, and that the State of Connecticut, the town of Old Saybrook, the Old Saybrook Waterfront Commission, and the local chamber of commerce have all favorably reported on the project. The State has gone so far as to provide its share of the cash contribution, and the town of Old Saybrook has directed its board of finance to provide the town's share of the cash contribution. Accordingly, the committee has approved the funds recommended by the House for this project.

## CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

The committee directs that \$300,000 of the increase of \$1 million recommended over the House amount be applied to the Cutler drain unit in accordance with the amended budget submitted in Senate Document 90.

## PALM BEACH HARBOR, FLA.

Last year, the committee appropriated funds for the initiation of construction of this project. No objection was voiced at that time. When the budget for the current fiscal year was announced no objections were brought to the attention of the committee nor was there any reaction to the accounts in the press of local delegations appearing before the Appropriations Committees in support of this project. Subsequently, however, after the hearings on the bill were concluded, the committee received numerous letters, communications, and visits from opponents of the project. As a result of these objections, the committee has taken the matter up with the Corps of Engineers and has been informed that the funds appropriated last year were utilized to initiate a continuing contract for the central portion of the authorized deepening, which includes the dogleg that was the location of several serious groundings last year. The funds requested for fiscal year 1965 are to be utilized for the continuation and completion of the contract now underway. The committee desires that the Corps of Engineers reevaluate the economic justification for this project based on current conditions and be prepared to present up-to-date factual information to the committee at the time of the fiscal year 1966 appropriations hearings.

## ENGLAND POND LEVEE, ILLINOIS

The committee deleted the \$30,000 recommended by the House since this project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of only 0.6 to 1 on a 100-year basis.

## MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE DISTRICT AND MUSCATINE-LOUISA COUNTY DRAINAGE DISTRICT No. 13, IOWA

The committee has deleted the \$100,000 inserted by the House for this project since it has been informed that the corps has carryover



funds which would be sufficient to carry construction through fiscal year 1965.

#### MILFORD RESERVOIR, KANS.

As a result of the construction of the Milford Reservoir, the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. will lose a large percentage of its subscribers and has obtained permission from the Kansas State Corporation Commission to go out of business. The testimony presented to the committee indicates the need for special legislation to provide for extension of telephone service by other companies to the customers which would be cut off from service by the decision of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. to cease service. Accordingly, the committee recommends the inclusion of the following language:

*, of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Company to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.*

#### GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

In view of the low water levels being experienced in the upper Great Lakes, the committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite the preparation of plans for the authorized compensating works in order that those plans can be submitted to the Canadian Government for approval at the earliest practical date. As soon as these plans have been completed and approved by the Canadian Government, the corps should promptly request funds to initiate construction of the necessary compensating works.

#### BIG BEND RESERVOIR, S. DAK.

The committee has approved the inclusion of the following language:

*; and of which \$131,500 shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counselor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized*

The committee has received assurance that the road can be built for the amount specified and has taken this action with the understanding that no further request will be made for this road or the extension thereof. Since this road will be turned over to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for maintenance, the committee would have no objection to the corps transferring the above sum to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for construction by that agency.

If the road cannot be built for the sum herein provided none of the funds included in this appropriation are to be used for this road.

#### GATHRIGHT RESERVOIR, VA.

While the committee has approved the \$150,000 unbudgeted planning item inserted by the House, it desires that the Corps of Engineers utilize the funds provided in planning a project where the maximum drawdown will not exceed 10-feet in order not to destroy the recreational potential of the area.

## JUSTICE RESERVOIR, W. VA.

Subsequent to the time that the House reported the public works appropriation bill, the Corps of Engineers reported to the committees that channel improvements and upstream reservoirs would not provide a satisfactory alternate to the main stem flood control structure. They further reported that they are studying an alternate site approximately 5 miles downstream which they anticipate will have a substantially less impact on the coal reserves of the area. Under these circumstances, the committee feels that at such time as the Corps of Engineers can finalize their recommendations as to the relative merits of these two sites, they should proceed with the detailed planning, on the selected site, only to the point necessary to present accurate cost estimates for the project, and relocations at a public hearing and to meet the other requirements set forth in last year's report of this committee.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$154, 000, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 158, 676, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 158, 676, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 158, 676, 000   |

The committee recommends \$158,676,000, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

The details of the committee's recommendations are shown in the following table:

*Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1965*

| Item                                                                      | Approved<br>budget<br>estimate<br>for fiscal<br>year 1965 | House<br>allowance | Amount rec-<br>ommended<br>by committee |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| (1)                                                                       | (2)                                                       | (3)                | (4)                                     |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL                                        |                                                           |                    |                                         |
| 1. Navigation:                                                            |                                                           |                    |                                         |
| (a) Channels and harbors.....                                             | \$82, 579, 000                                            | \$82, 579, 000     | \$82, 579, 000                          |
| (b) Locks, dams, and canals.....                                          | 29, 644, 000                                              | 29, 644, 000       | 29, 644, 000                            |
| 2. Flood control:                                                         |                                                           |                    |                                         |
| (a) Reservoirs.....                                                       | 12, 017, 000                                              | 12, 107, 000       | 12, 017, 000                            |
| (b) Channel improvements, inspections, and miscellaneous maintenance..... | 1, 101, 000                                               | 1, 101, 000        | 1, 101, 000                             |
| 3. Multiple-purpose projects including power.....                         | 27, 281, 000                                              | 27, 281, 000       | 27, 281, 000                            |
| 4. Protection of navigation.....                                          | 5, 979, 000                                               | 5, 979, 000        | 5, 979, 000                             |
| 5. Niagara remedial works.....                                            | 75, 000                                                   | 75, 000            | 75, 000                                 |
| Total, operation and maintenance, general.....                            | 158, 676, 000                                             | 158, 676, 000      | 158, 676, 000                           |

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE, AND SHORE PROTECTION  
EMERGENCIES

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | (1)           |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | \$4, 150, 000 |
| House allowance.....          | 4, 150, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 4, 150, 000   |

<sup>1</sup> Last year \$5,700,000 was appropriated for this purpose under O. & M.

This is a new appropriation item which includes funds for the hurricane, flood control, and shore protection emergencies previously carried under the appropriation title "Operation and maintenance."

### GENERAL EXPENSES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$15,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 15,575,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 15,575,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 15,575,000   |

The committee recommends \$15,575,000, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. The increase in this item above the 1964 level provides principally for the cost of the pay act increases.

The details of the committee's recommendation are shown on the following table:

#### *General expenses, fiscal year 1965*

| Item<br>(1)                                           | Approved<br>budget<br>estimate for<br>fiscal year<br>1965<br>(2) | House<br>allowance<br>(3) | Amount<br>recommended<br>by committee<br>(4) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <b>GENERAL EXPENSES</b>                               |                                                                  |                           |                                              |
| 1. Executive direction and management:                |                                                                  |                           |                                              |
| (a) Office, Chief of Engineers.....                   | \$5,350,000                                                      | \$5,350,000               | \$5,350,000                                  |
| (b) Division offices.....                             | 8,193,000                                                        | 8,193,000                 | 8,193,000                                    |
| Subtotal, executive direction and management...       | 13,543,000                                                       | 13,543,000                | 13,543,000                                   |
| 2. River and Harbor Board.....                        | 642,000                                                          | 642,000                   | 642,000                                      |
| 3. U.S. Army Coastal Engineering Research Center..... | 180,000                                                          | 180,000                   | 180,000                                      |
| 4. Commercial statistics.....                         | 1,030,000                                                        | 1,030,000                 | 1,030,000                                    |
| 5. Special investigations.....                        | 180,000                                                          | 180,000                   | 180,000                                      |
| Total, general expenses.....                          | 15,575,000                                                       | 15,575,000                | 15,575,000                                   |

### FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$77,862,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 71,860,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 73,550,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 79,920,000   |

The committee recommends \$79,920,000, an increase of \$6,370,000 over the House and \$8,060,000 over the budget. Two million dollars of this increase is for maintenance. The increased maintenance is required for erosion control in the lower river, and to correct a serious scour condition that developed below the Old River control structure, which condition has been aggravated by barges that broke away from their moorings and lodged in the gates of that structure.

The details of the committee recommendation are shown on the following table:



## Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1965

| Construction, general, State and project<br><br>(1)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Total<br>estimated<br>Federal cost<br><br>(2)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Amount<br>appropriated<br>to date<br><br>(3)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965                                                                                                                                                                                               |                 | House allowance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                 | Amount recommended<br>by committee                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Construction<br>(4)                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6)                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Planning<br>(9) |
| 1. General investigations:<br>(a) Examinations and surveys.....<br>(b) Collection and study of basic data.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | \$1,993,000<br>690,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | \$65,000<br>85,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                 | \$90,000<br>85,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                 | \$125,000<br>85,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                 |
| Subtotal, general investigations.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 2,683,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 150,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                 | 175,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                 | 210,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                 |
| 2. Construction and planning:<br>Mississippi River levees.....<br>Channel improvement.....<br>Memphis Harbor.....<br>Old River control.....<br>St. Francis Basin.....<br>West Tennessee tributaries.....<br>Lower Arkansas River.....<br>Tensas Basin:<br>Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.....<br>Red River backwater.....<br>Yazoo Basin:<br>Sardis Reservoir.....<br>Enid Reservoir.....<br>Arkabutla Reservoir.....<br>Grenada Reservoir.....<br>Greenwood.....<br>Upper auxiliary channels.....<br>Main stem.....<br>Tributaries.....<br>Big Sunflower River, etc.....<br>Yazoo backwater.....<br>Bayou Coccodrre and tributaries.....<br>Atchafalaya Basin.....<br>Lake Pontchartrain..... | \$241,000,000<br>717,000,000<br>19,000,000<br>67,100,000<br>111,000,000<br>9,390,000<br>25,600,000<br>37,200,000<br>27,300,000<br>12,520,000<br>15,650,000<br>13,190,000<br>31,920,000<br>3,190,000<br>13,856,000<br>22,800,000<br>30,600,000<br>16,200,000<br>29,600,000<br>5,700,000<br>180,000,000<br>6,510,000 | 207,200,000<br>510,039,000<br>16,600,000<br>60,128,000<br>52,136,000<br>2,465,000<br>21,853,000<br>22,084,000<br>8,115,000<br>11,898,000<br>15,219,000<br>12,088,000<br>31,427,000<br>4,053,000<br>14,298,000<br>8,072,000<br>8,913,000<br>3,230,000<br>3,428,000<br>122,484,000<br>5,349,000 | 3,800,000<br>24,500,000<br>600,000<br>200,000<br>3,700,000<br>1,400,000<br>300,000<br>900,000<br>200,000<br>70,000<br>40,000<br>40,000<br>50,000<br>700,000<br>100,000<br>800,000<br>1,600,000<br>1,850,000<br>300,000<br>7,200,000<br>210,000 |                 | 3,800,000<br>26,165,000<br>600,000<br>200,000<br>3,700,000<br>1,400,000<br>300,000<br>900,000<br>200,000<br>70,000<br>40,000<br>40,000<br>50,000<br>700,000<br>100,000<br>800,000<br>1,600,000<br>1,850,000<br>300,000<br>7,200,000<br>210,000 |                 | 4,000,000<br>27,250,000<br>600,000<br>200,000<br>3,700,000<br>1,400,000<br>300,000<br>900,000<br>300,000<br>70,000<br>40,000<br>40,000<br>50,000<br>700,000<br>100,000<br>800,000<br>1,600,000<br>2,000,000<br>300,000<br>10,000,000<br>210,000 |                 |
| Subtotal, construction and planning.....<br>Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 1,892,941,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 1,319,641,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 49,210,000<br>-1,500,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                 | 50,875,000<br>-1,500,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                 | 55,210,000<br>-1,500,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                 |
| 3. Maintenance<br>Total, construction and planning.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 1,892,941,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 1,319,641,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 47,710,000<br>24,000,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                 | 49,375,000<br>24,000,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                 | 53,710,000<br>26,000,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                 |
| Grand total.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 1,917,941,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 1,337,224,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 71,860,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                 | 73,550,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                 | 79,920,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                 |

## THE PANAMA CANAL

## CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT OPERATING EXPENSES

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1964 appropriation.....       | \$25, 725, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 29, 088, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 29, 088, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 29, 088, 000   |

The committee recommends \$29,088,000 for operating expenses of the Canal Zone government. The Canal Zone government is responsible in the Canal Zone for those functions which normally are performed by State and local governments. Initially the cost of these operations and functions are paid from appropriated funds. Annually the Federal Treasury is reimbursed for the net cost of Canal Zone government. The principal increases above the 1964 level are required for the educational system and for clinics and hospitals.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1964 appropriation.....       | \$6, 500, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 4, 821, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 4, 821, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 4, 821, 000   |

The committee recommends \$4,821,000 the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House for the capital outlay program. The capital program is financed in two ways. Part of the cost of the program is financed by the net operating income from company activities. The capital program of the Canal Zone government is initially financed by appropriations which are subsequently repaid over a period of years through annual depreciation charges.

The committee notes a substantial reduction in the appropriation requested under this head, which reflects the efforts of the present administration to hold construction programs to the minimum necessary for operation of the physical plant.

## PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

CORPORATION LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,  
PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1964 limitation.....          | \$9, 285, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 10, 639, 000  |
| House allowance.....          | 10, 639, 000  |
| Committee recommendation..... | 10, 639, 000  |

The committee recommends \$10,639,000 the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. The increase of \$1.3 million over the current limitation is required for pay increases and for nonpersonnel costs. No new positions are involved.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Budget estimates in the amount of \$430,500,000 were considered by the committee for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee also considered an emergency need for the National Park Service. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$433,639,000 for these purposes. This is \$54,136,000 over the House allowance of \$379,503,000; \$24,316,800 over the fiscal year 1964 appropriations of \$409,322,200; and \$3,139,000 over the budget estimates.

The committee's recommendations with regard to each appropriation are set forth under individual headings in this report.

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## CONSTRUCTION

(Supplemental, 1965)

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1965-----      | \$27, 373, 600 |
| Committee recommendation----- | 1, 800, 000    |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,800,000 to extend recreational and utility facilities and generally to clean up the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. This activity is made necessary by the lowering of the water level at Lake Mead as a result of filling Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam. Senate Document No. 89 proposed that this amount be made available by transfer from the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation of the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the committee has recommended an appropriation to the National Park Service which it offsets by an increase in the amount allowed in the Bureau of Reclamation budget as an "undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays."



## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$10,294,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 10,500,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 10,354,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 12,404,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,404,000 for the general investigations program of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is an increase of \$2,050,000 over the House allowance of \$10,354,000 and \$1,904,000 over the budget estimate of \$10,500,000.

*Alaskan investigations.*—Of the \$146,000 reduction in this activity made by the House of Representatives the committee recommends a restoration of \$50,000. This is the amount which was intended in the budget for transfer to the "Federal Reconstruction and Planning Commission for Alaska," and on the basis of this proposed transfer the remainder necessary for operation of the Commission during fiscal year 1965 was appropriated in the Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1964.

*Palmdale, Calif., \$56,000.*—The committee approves the Department proposal that \$56,000 of available funds be used for continued work on a feasibility report of the Palmdale project, California.

*Weather modification research, \$2 million.*—The committee recommends an increase of \$2 million in the amount (\$100,000) programed for weather modification research. The increase is to be divided between research on orographic and convective weather systems. Emphasis is to be placed on actual water production and the exploration and research is to include application of existing weather modification methods.

## CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

|                               | Budget program | New obligational authority |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$223,810,584  | \$185,431,000              |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 199,599,015    | <sup>1</sup> 185,324,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 200,008,015    | 182,433,000                |
| Committee recommendation..... | 208,564,015    | 185,689,000                |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects reduction of \$706,000 in H. Doc. 309, and increase of \$3,300,000 in S. Doc. 89.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$185,689,000 to finance a construction program of \$208,564,015. The budget estimate of \$185,324,000 is based on an undistributed reduction because of anticipated delays of \$17,575,015, as is the House allowance of \$182,433,000. The committee recommends that the undistributed reduction be increased to \$22,875,015. The difference of \$5,300,000 is equal to the total of the estimates for projects in Senate Document No. 89 which were proposed to be financed within available funds or by transfer from this appropriation.

The committee's recommended program of construction and rehabilitation is shown in the following table:

| Project                                                                                           | Budget estimate | House allowance | Committee recommendation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Delivery of water to Mexico.....                                                                  |                 |                 | \$2,000,000              |
| Malta, Mont., street improvement.....                                                             |                 |                 | 26,000                   |
| Advance planning.....                                                                             | \$200,000       | \$200,000       | 200,000                  |
| Gila project, Arizona.....                                                                        | 1,190,000       | 1,190,000       | 1,190,000                |
| Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California.....                                    | 4,265,000       | 4,665,000       | 4,665,000                |
| Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada.....                                              | 1,482,000       | 1,482,000       | 1,482,000                |
| Central Valley project, California.....                                                           | 55,546,000      | 55,280,000      | 54,480,000               |
| Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie.....                                                 | 3,300,000       |                 | 3,300,000                |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.....                                                         | 6,200,000       | 6,200,000       | 6,200,000                |
| Mann Creek project, Idaho.....                                                                    | 725,000         | 725,000         | 725,000                  |
| Wichita project, Cheyney division, Kansas.....                                                    | 1,480,000       | 1,480,000       | 1,480,000                |
| Arbuckle project, Oklahoma.....                                                                   | 3,500,000       | 3,500,000       | 3,500,000                |
| Norman project, Oklahoma.....                                                                     | 3,221,000       | 3,221,000       | 3,221,000                |
| Baker project, upper division, Oregon.....                                                        | 700,000         | 700,000         | 700,000                  |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg.....                    | 400,000         | 400,000         | 400,000                  |
| The Dalles project, western division, Oregon.....                                                 | 2,393,800       | 2,393,800       | 2,393,800                |
| Canadian River project, Texas.....                                                                | 22,100,000      | 22,100,000      | 22,100,000               |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas.....                            | 783,000         | 783,000         | 783,000                  |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas.....                            | 775,000         | 775,000         | 775,000                  |
| Weber Basin project, Utah.....                                                                    | 7,786,000       | 7,786,000       | 7,986,000                |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville, Tonasket unit, Washington..... | 400,000         | 400,000         | 400,000                  |
| Columbia Basin project, Washington.....                                                           | 6,800,000       | 6,800,000       | 8,300,000                |
| Spokane Valley project, Washington.....                                                           | 1,918,000       | 1,918,000       | 1,918,000                |
| Riverton project, 3d division, Wyoming.....                                                       | 1,300,000       | 1,300,000       | 1,300,000                |
| Drainage and minor construction.....                                                              | 1,412,964       | 1,412,964       | 1,412,964                |
| Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....                                           | 4,544,251       | 4,144,251       | 4,144,251                |
| Reclamation office building.....                                                                  |                 |                 | 2,650,000                |
| Subtotal.....                                                                                     | 132,422,015     | 128,856,015     | 137,732,015              |
| Missouri River Basin project:                                                                     |                 |                 |                          |
| Ainsworth unit, Nebraska.....                                                                     | 6,500,000       | 6,500,000       | 6,500,000                |
| Almena unit, Kansas.....                                                                          | 1,350,000       | 2,200,000       | 2,200,000                |
| East Bench unit, Montana.....                                                                     | 780,000         | 780,000         | 780,000                  |
| Farwell unit, Nebraska.....                                                                       | 2,700,000       | 2,700,000       | 2,700,000                |
| Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....                                                       | 665,000         | 665,000         | 665,000                  |
| Glen Elder unit, Kansas.....                                                                      | 8,400,000       | 8,400,000       | 8,400,000                |
| Transmission division.....                                                                        | 22,175,000      | 22,175,000      | 21,585,000               |
| Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming.....                                                             | 19,950,000      | 19,950,000      | 19,950,000               |
| Drainage and minor construction.....                                                              | 1,915,000       | 1,915,000       | 1,915,000                |
| Investigations.....                                                                               | 1,743,000       | 1,668,000       | 1,893,000                |
| Advance planning.....                                                                             | 950,000         | 850,000         | 850,000                  |
| Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project.....                                                       | 67,128,000      | 67,803,000      | 67,438,000               |
| Other Department of the Interior agencies.....                                                    | 3,349,000       | 3,349,000       | 3,394,000                |
| Total, Missouri River Basin project.....                                                          | 70,477,000      | 71,152,000      | 70,832,000               |
| Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation.....                                                    | 202,899,015     | 200,008,015     | 208,564,015              |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....                                          | -17,575,015     | -17,575,015     | -22,875,015              |
| Total, construction and rehabilitation.....                                                       | 185,324,000     | 182,433,000     | 185,689,000              |

*Delivery of water to Mexico, \$2 million.*—The committee recommends an increase of \$2 million over the budget estimate for construction of additional tile drains in the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, for the purpose of further improving the quality of Colorado River water to be delivered to Mexico under the treaty of 1944 between the United States and Mexico. Inasmuch as this expenditure is not for the benefit of the irrigation district, the committee recommends that it be nonreimbursable. Senate Document No. 89 proposed that this sum be made available within available funds. Instead, the committee provided an appropriation and has offset it by increasing the amount allowed for slippage.

*Malta, Mont., street improvements.*—The committee recommends an increase of \$26,000 for payment to the city of Malta, Mont., to reimburse the city for the cost of street and other improvements benefiting Department of the Interior agencies there.



*Colorado River front and levee system.*—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,665,000 for the Colorado River front and levee system. This will provide \$400,000 not proposed in the budget but allowed by the House of Representatives, for drilling four additional drainage wells in the South Gila Valley unit of the Gila project. Tests related to the program now underway show the need for these additional wells.

Included in the recommendation of the committee is the budget request of \$700,000 for ground water recovery and river regulation in the Lower Colorado River area. However, the committee directs that these funds not be expended until contractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary have been made with the affected water users.

*Central Valley project.*—San Luis unit: The committee recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 for initiation of work on a distribution system for the Westlands Water District. This construction should begin in the coming fiscal year in order to be completed when stored water of the San Luis unit is available for use. Senate Document No. 89 proposed that this amount be taken from available funds, but, instead, the committee has provided an appropriation and has offset it by increasing the amount allowed for slippage.

The committee has not recommended \$266,000 budgeted for additional bays at the Folsom switchyard for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Roseville interconnection inasmuch as the requirement for this construction has been eliminated.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$2,300,000 in the budget program proposed for transmission facilities in the San Luis project. The Department has before it a private utility offer to furnish transmission and distribution service for Federal power operations at or below the cost to the Federal Government of providing such service, as well as a tentative proposal of a similar nature by a water district. A payment to either the company or the district would not be required during this year.

The language in the bill limiting the use of funds for the drain in connection with the San Luis unit is not intended to prevent the United States from entering into an arrangement with the State of California for construction of a drain serving both the Federal San Luis service area and other areas sought to be provided with drainage by the State. Nor is the language intended to prevent initiation of construction, which will necessarily commence south of Contra Costa County. Nor does the committee intend any approval of a discharge point upstream from the Contra Costa County line on the San Joaquin River. The committee simply intends the language to preclude the use of these particular funds in any manner determinative of the point of discharge of the drain and the committee does not establish a precedent as to future appropriations. The committee has concluded that, based on evidence presently available, the point of discharge need not and should not now be finally decided upon. Continuing studies by Federal, State, and local authorities should result in a fully informed decision, in the interest of all values affected, prior to the time a decision need be reached and funds to implement that decision are appropriated.

*Lewis Creek Water District, California.*—The committee concurs in the House recommendation that within available funds \$15,000 be



utilized to develop data necessary to formulate a distribution system contract for the Lewis Creek Water District.

*Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, \$3,300,000.*—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,300,000 to initiate construction of transmission lines between the power system of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific Southwest recommended in the report of the Secretary of the Interior on June 24, 1964, as amended on July 21 and July 27, 1964. This amount, together with a carryover from fiscal year 1964 of \$1,675,000 will provide a total of \$4,975,000 for this construction.

Of the total amount, \$1,800,000 is to be applied to that portion of the 750-kilovolt direct-current line between the Oregon-Nevada border and Hoover Dam; \$700,000 to the direct-current terminal at Hoover Dam; \$1,475,000 to the 345-kilovolt alternating-current line between Hoover Dam and Pinnacle Peak via Phoenix, Ariz.; \$500,000 for interconnection of Hoover buses; and \$500,000 to that portion of the 500-kilovolt alternating-current line from the Oregon-California border to Round Mountain and to the 230-kilovolt alternating-current line from Round Mountain to Cottonwood or Keswick.

The requirements and restrictions set forth by the committee as applicable to the extra-high-voltage interconnection for which funds are recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration (p. 37) shall govern use of these funds.

*Weber Basin project, \$200,000.*—The committee recommends an increase of \$200,000 for the improvement of the highway from Porterville, Utah, to the East Canyon damsite. It is the desire of the committee that before this sum is obligated, the State of Utah agree to assume financial responsibility for maintaining the road.

*Columbia Basin project, \$1,500,000.*—The committee recommends an additional \$1,500,000 for the Columbia Basin project. This will provide for construction of laterals to serve blocks 21 and 48 at an estimated cost of \$450,000 in the coming fiscal year; \$550,000 for initiation of construction of the radar pump plant; and \$500,000 to commence construction on the first section of the Wahluke Branch Canal extension.

*Rehabilitation and betterment.*—The Department has advised that late validation of a repayment contract has made unnecessary \$400,000 of the amount requested for work on the All-American Canal, Coachella division. Therefore, this amount is not included in the committee's recommendations.

*Denver office building, \$2,650,000.*—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,650,000 to initiate construction of an office building in the Denver Federal Center to house the engineering activities of the Bureau of Reclamation for which designs and specifications are complete. It is directed that the building be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation at the site and in conformity with the design already approved by the Bureau. The unsatisfactory and inadequate conditions described in this committee's report last year have not bettered; and in order to alleviate this bad situation construction, which will require about 2 years, should begin as promptly as possible.

*Missouri River Basin project.*—Almena unit: The committee concurs in the House recommendation of an increase of \$850,000 in order to begin construction of the planned irrigation facilities on the Almena unit. This amount will provide for acquisition of rights-of-way,

completion of designs and specifications, award of construction contracts, and initiation of construction on the Ahnena diversion dam and on the Ahnena canals and laterals.

**Transmission division:** The committee recommends a reduction of \$590,000 in the program for the transmission division which is to be applied to the proposed Jamestown-Grand Forks 115-kilovolt transmission line No. 2 and substations, and the proposed Mallard-Minot Airbase 115-kilovolt transmission line and substation facilities. It is the opinion of the committee that the desired transmission is available through use of non-Federal facilities to serve existing and foreseeable demand.

The committee recommends that within available funds \$100,000 be used to complete studies at the earliest practicable time for a transmission system in the general area between Granite Falls and Jackson, Minn.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and Spencer, Iowa.

The Bureau of Reclamation in making cost comparisons between commercial proposals for and Government provisions of microwave and other communication facilities used in connection with its power operations shall include as a part of the Government's cost an allowance for Federal, State, and local taxes to the extent that such taxes would apply for the alternative commercial proposals as provided for in Bureau of the Budget Circular 60-2, September 21, 1959; interest cost of at least the current rate for long-term Treasury bonds; and service life costs and operation and maintenance costs which are fair and reasonable and consistent with the operating results of those using comparable equipment.

*Investigations.*—The committee recommends an additional appropriation of \$75,000 to broaden the Marias-Milk unit investigation to the Lower Marias area to determine the feasibility of providing irrigation service to these lands.

The committee also recommends an increase of \$150,000 for continuing preconstruction work on the Nebraska Mid-State project at the current year's level.

The committee recommends that within available funds \$75,000 be utilized to develop a feasibility report on the Blue division of the Missouri River Basin project; and that \$20,000 be used to undertake a reconnaissance study of the Sheep Creek unit.

*Transfers to participating agencies.*—The committee recommends an increase in the amount for transfer to the National Park Service of \$45,000. This will permit archeological work in the Missouri River Basin to continue at the same rate as in the past year. Without the increase field salvage work would be less because of higher costs.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                               |                             |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | <sup>1</sup> \$37, 697, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | <sup>2</sup> 40, 219, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 40, 219, 000                |
| Committee recommendation..... | 40, 219, 000                |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects transfer to Bureau of Land Management of \$303,000 in Public Law 88-317.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects reduction of \$81,000 in H. Doc. 240.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$40,219,000 for operation and maintenance of Bureau of Reclamation facilities. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate.



## LOAN PROGRAM

|                               |                         |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$12,367,000            |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | <sup>1</sup> 12,307,000 |
| House allowance.....          | 12,307,000              |
| Committee recommendation..... | 12,307,000              |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects reduction of \$1,263,000 in H. Doc. 309.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,307,000, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate, for loans for the construction of irrigation distribution systems under Public Law 130, 84th Congress, and for construction, rehabilitation, and betterment of small reclamation projects under Public Law 984, 84th Congress.

The committee's recommended program is shown in the following table:

| Project                                                | Budget estimate | House allowance | Committee recommendation |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, California.....   | \$8,000,000     | \$8,000,000     | \$8,000,000              |
| Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, California.....     | 230,000         | 230,000         | 230,000                  |
| Broadview Water District, California.....              | 1,140,000       | 1,140,000       | 1,140,000                |
| Eastern Municipal Water District, California.....      | 44,338          | 44,338          | 44,338                   |
| Hooper Irrigation District, Utah.....                  | 572,000         | 572,000         | 572,000                  |
| Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California.....    | 1,023,000       | 1,023,000       | 1,023,000                |
| King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho.....              | 258,000         | 258,000         | 258,000                  |
| Roosevelt Irrigation District, Arizona.....            | 555,000         | 555,000         | 555,000                  |
| South San Joaquin Irrigation District, California..... | 648,000         | 648,000         | 648,000                  |
| St. John Irrigation Co., Idaho.....                    | 687,000         | 687,000         | 687,000                  |
| Subtotal.....                                          | 13,157,338      | 13,157,338      | 13,157,338               |
| Administration.....                                    | 132,662         | 132,662         | 132,662                  |
| Total fund requirement.....                            | 13,290,000      | 13,290,000      | 13,290,000               |
| Application of prior year funds.....                   | -983,000        | -983,000        | -983,000                 |
| Appropriation required for fiscal year 1965.....       | 12,307,000      | 12,307,000      | 12,307,000               |

## EMERGENCY FUND

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1 million to reimburse the emergency fund, Bureau of Reclamation, for the cost of repairing flood damage to irrigation facilities of the Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects. The damage resulted from the flood of June 9, 1964. Ordinarily expenditures from the emergency fund are reimbursable by the water users in whose behalf they are disbursed. It is the view of the committee that the water users are eligible for reimbursement from funds available to the Office of Emergency Planning. However, OEP has not yet determined this eligibility and the repair work must go forward.

To the extent that Office of Emergency Planning funds are made available, expenditures will not be made from the emergency fund; and the appropriation will be available only through this fiscal year.

## UPPER COLORADO STORAGE PROJECT

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$97,989,200 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 62,300,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 62,300,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 62,300,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$62,300,000. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The committee's recommended program is shown in the following table:



| Project                                                  | Budget estimate | House allowance | Committee recommendation |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Upper Colorado River Basin Fund:                         |                 |                 |                          |
| Advance planning.....                                    | \$1,405,000     | \$1,405,000     | \$1,405,000              |
| Construction:                                            |                 |                 |                          |
| Colorado River storage project:                          |                 |                 |                          |
| Curecanti unit, Colorado.....                            | 17,745,000      | 17,745,000      | 17,745,000               |
| Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah.....                      | 7,700,000       | 7,700,000       | 7,700,000                |
| Transmission division.....                               | 21,919,000      | 21,919,000      | 21,919,000               |
| Participating projects:                                  |                 |                 |                          |
| Emery County project, Utah.....                          | 4,433,000       | 4,433,000       | 4,433,000                |
| Lyman project, Wyoming-Utah.....                         | 1,000,000       | 1,000,000       | 1,000,000                |
| San Juan-Chama project, Colorado-New Mexico.....         | 7,000,000       | 7,000,000       | 7,000,000                |
| Seedskaadee project, Wyoming.....                        | 1,051,000       | 1,051,000       | 1,051,000                |
| Silt project, Colorado.....                              | 3,027,000       | 3,027,000       | 3,027,000                |
| Drainage and minor construction.....                     | 371,272         | 371,272         | 371,272                  |
| Subtotal.....                                            | 65,651,272      | 65,651,272      | 65,651,272               |
| Operation and maintenance.....                           | 33,000          | 33,000          | 33,000                   |
| Recreation and fish and wildlife facilities:             |                 |                 |                          |
| National Park Service.....                               | 3,200,000       | 3,200,000       | 3,200,000                |
| Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....              | 1,300,000       | 1,300,000       | 1,300,000                |
| Subtotal.....                                            | 70,184,272      | 70,184,272      | 70,184,272               |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays..... | -7,884,272      | -7,884,272      | -7,884,272               |
| Total.....                                               | 62,300,000      | 62,300,000      | 62,300,000               |

*Operation and maintenance.*—The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in approving the use of \$3,200,000 of construction funds for the purchase of replacement power during the filling of Lake Powell. Current studies indicate that runoff of the Colorado River is expected to be substantially below average which will reduce anticipated revenues to be derived from the sale of water and power; and it is estimated that this deficiency in revenues and the increased requirements for purchase of deficiency power for the Boulder Canyon project will require this additional sum.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$10,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 10,400,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 10,400,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 10,400,000   |

The committee recommends \$10,400,000 for general administrative expenses—the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance.

#### BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

##### CONSTRUCTION

|                               |                         |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$36,204,000            |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | <sup>1</sup> 89,020,000 |
| House allowance.....          | 41,220,000              |
| Committee recommendation..... | 87,420,000              |

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$45,200,000 in S. Doc. 89.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$87,420,000 for the construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration. This is \$46,200,000 million over the House allowance and \$1,600,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee recommends restoration of \$1 million of the \$1,600,000 decrease by the House to account for delays and slippages. To do otherwise would provide an allowance for this purpose equal to

28 percent of the construction program proposed in the original budget estimate.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3 million to initiate construction of a transmission line and other facilities to serve a new aluminum plant to be constructed near Bellingham, Wash.

The committee concurs with the House in not providing \$1 million for initiation of the proposed extra-high-voltage transmission line from the Bonneville power area to southern Idaho.

*Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, \$42,200,000.*—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$42,200,000 to initiate construction of three of the four transmission lines between the power system of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific Southwest recommended in the report of the Secretary of the Interior on June 24, 1964, as amended on July 21 and July 27, 1964. The committee's recommendation is based upon acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of those proposals for participation in the construction of the intertie transmission facilities submitted by non-Federal agencies, which the Secretary indicates in his report, as amended, he will utilize in effectuating the intertie.

Of this amount, \$1 million is for the Oregon portion of the 750-kilovolt direct-current line between The Dalles Dam and Hoover Dam; \$29,300,000 for the Oregon portion of the 750-kilovolt direct-current line from The Dalles Dam via Nevada to the Sylmar substation, Los Angeles; and \$11,900,000 for the Oregon portion of the 500-kilovolt alternating-current line between the John Day Dam via the Central Valley of California to the Vincent substation, Los Angeles.

The committee directs that before construction of The Dalles Dam-Hoover Dam line begins, the Secretary shall review load potentials on the line and find that it will be financially feasible and self-liquidating over its service life. In this review, he will consider the importance of this line to, and its economic effect on, the entire intertie system which he has recommended, and shall take cognizance of the economic value of the line for diversity exchanges between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, as well as the advantages to the Federal Government of an interconnection between two major federally owned power systems. Before energy generated in the upper division of the Colorado River Basin may be displaced by energy transmitted on The Dalles Dam-Hoover Dam line, the Secretary shall insure that said displaced energy is marketable in such quantities and at such rates as to assure that the repayment schedule of the Upper Colorado River Basin fund will not be delayed or otherwise adversely affected; and will not displace energy supplied to consumers (excepting co-operatives and public bodies as defined in the Bonneville Project Act) from any other source.

With respect to the intertie lines, the committee approves the existing policy of the Department to the effect that it will not enter into contracts which call for wheeling charges greater than Federal costs for such service, or which do not provide to the Department wheeling capacity in the lines to meet its full requirements. It is the desire of the committee that all such contracts be made public and be transmitted to the Senate not less than 60 days before their effective dates.

The committee directs that none of these funds shall be expended until there has been enacted into law S. 1007, or similar legislation, guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority.

The committee also directs that no contracts between the Secretary and non-Federal agencies for construction of portions of these transmission lines shall be effective until funds appropriated in this act become available after requirements set forth in this report have been met; and until the Secretary has directed the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with construction of all those portions of the transmission lines for which appropriations are provided in this bill. It is the desire of the committee that construction of the 750-kilovolt direct-current line between The Dalles Dam and Hoover Dam shall commence not later than construction of other lines of the intertie is initiated.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                               |                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | <sup>1</sup> \$13,840,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 14,980,000                |
| House allowance.....          | 14,980,000                |
| Committee recommendation..... | 14,980,000                |

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$340,000 in Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1964.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,980,000, an amount equal to the budget estimate and the House allowance.

#### SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

##### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$1,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 1,000,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 1,000,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 1,000,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1 million—the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance—for marketing power and energy generated at Corps of Engineers hydroelectric plants in the southeastern area of the United States. This sum will provide for system operation and maintenance, power contracts and rates, general administration, and purchase of energy and wheeling charges.

#### SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

##### CONSTRUCTION

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$3,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 2,770,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 2,610,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 2,440,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,440,000 for the construction activities of the Southwestern Power Administration. This is \$170,000 under the House allowance, and \$330,000 under the budget estimate.



The committee concurs with the action of the House of Representatives in not allowing funds for construction of a transmission line between Carthage, Mo., and Coffeyville, Kans.; and has further reduced the budget estimate by \$170,000 programed for the Kennett, Mo., substation and the transmission interconnections between southeast Missouri municipalities. The committee desires that wherever possible the Secretary of the Interior utilize locally owned transmission facilities rather than construct duplicating facilities.

The committee has allowed the \$650,000 requested for initiating construction of the proposed transmission line to interconnect the Dardanelle Dam and Greers Ferry Dam. However, construction of this line shall not be undertaken unless agreement cannot be reached with the appropriate utility company or companies to provide the necessary electric service for which the line is proposed under terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his power marketing responsibilities.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTAINENCE

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$1,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 1,680,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 1,680,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 1,680,000   |

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,680,000, which is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance for operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.

#### CONTINUING FUND

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$4,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 4,500,000   |
| House allowance.....          | 4,500,000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 4,500,000   |

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in recommending appropriation of the budget estimate of \$4,500,000 for the purchase of power and rental of transmission facilities. The funds are derived from receipts from the sale of power and energy.

The committee reiterates its concern relative to differences between electric cooperatives and private utility companies; and urges that they make every effort peacefully to settle those differences, including amicable agreements for territorial jurisdiction.

### TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

The amount of increase recommended by the committee is a net figure of \$6,935,000, consisting of restorations in "Operating expenses" of \$17,935,000, offset by an increase in estimated revenues of \$11 million. No increase is recommended for "Plant and capital equipment."

Appropriations for the two items total \$2,631,008,000, which are \$61,992,000 under the budget estimates of \$2,693 million.

Recommendations for the activities of the Commission are detailed in the following paragraphs:

## OPERATING EXPENSES

|                               |                    |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$2, 342, 669, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....           | 2, 323, 000, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 2, 261, 073, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 2, 268, 008, 000   |

NOTE —In addition, applied revenues of \$47,066,000 are available.

*Operating expenses*

| Program                                                   | Budget estimate, 1965 | House allowance  | Senate Committee recommendation | Change proposed |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Raw materials.....                                        | \$267, 455, 000       | \$267, 455, 000  | \$267, 455, 000                 | 0               |
| Special nuclear materials.....                            | 401, 500, 000         | 395, 000, 000    | 398, 500, 000                   | +\$3, 500, 000  |
| Weapons.....                                              | 771, 747, 000         | 765, 000, 000    | 765, 000, 000                   | 0               |
| Reactor development.....                                  | 497, 900, 000         | 490, 000, 000    | 496, 435, 000                   | +6, 435, 000    |
| Physical research.....                                    | 222, 000, 000         | 210, 000, 000    | 218, 000, 000                   | +8, 000, 000    |
| Biology and medicine.....                                 | 80, 000, 000          | 78, 000, 000     | 78, 000, 000                    | 0               |
| Training, education, and information.....                 | 17, 700, 000          | 15, 700, 000     | 15, 700, 000                    | 0               |
| Civilian applications of—                                 |                       |                  |                                 |                 |
| Isotopes.....                                             | 10, 300, 000          | 9, 300, 000      | 9, 300, 000                     | 0               |
| Nuclear explosives.....                                   | 11, 000, 000          | 11, 000, 000     | 11, 000, 000                    | 0               |
| Communities.....                                          | 9, 035, 000           | 9, 035, 000      | 9, 035, 000                     | 0               |
| Program direction and administration.....                 | 76, 780, 000          | 76, 000, 000     | 76, 000, 000                    | 0               |
| Security investigations.....                              | 7, 000, 000           | 7, 000, 000      | 7, 000, 000                     | 0               |
| Cost of work for others.....                              | 5, 100, 000           | 5, 100, 000      | 5, 100, 000                     | 0               |
| Change in selected resources.....                         | -18, 451, 000         | -21, 451, 000    | -21, 451, 000                   | 0               |
| Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources..... | -36, 066, 000         | -36, 066, 000    | -47, 066, 000                   | -11, 000, 000   |
| Unobligated balance brought forward.....                  |                       | -20, 000, 000    | -20, 000, 000                   | 0               |
| Total.....                                                | 2, 323, 000, 000      | 2, 261, 073, 000 | 2, 268, 008, 000                | +6, 935, 000    |

*Special nuclear materials program.*—Restoration of \$3,500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$398,500,000 for this program, which is \$3 million below the budget estimate.

The committee is advised that while some production capacity may be closed down during the year, such reductions have been considered in the budget estimates, and a current review of requirements allows absorption of only \$3 million of the reduction.

*Reactor development program.*—Restoration of \$6,435,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$496,435,000 for this program, which is \$1,465,000 below the budget estimate.

For the PLUTO project, for the development of nuclear ramjet propulsion, the House allowed \$1 million for “mothballing” the project until such time as there is a military system and requirement for its use. For this purpose, however, more funds may be required, and the Commission requests restoration of \$4 million in order to meet additional closeout costs, as well as funds to review the technology generated from the PLUTO project in order to determine its application to other advancements in reactor technology. The committee agrees that this project, having generated intricate technology on high temperature reactors from a combined expenditure of some \$200 million by the Commission and the Air Force, should be so reviewed during 1965.

The balance of the restoration, \$2,435,000, is to provide for activities which would be materially affected by general reductions which in many projects reduce funds below the 1964 level.

*Physical research program.*—Restoration of \$8 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$218 million for this program, which is \$4 million below the budget estimate.

The committee is advised that this restoration is vitally needed in order to prevent serious curtailment of the entire program, and to allow for the most efficient utilization of facilities at the national laboratories, many of which are newly available.

*Increase in revenues applied.*—Included in amendments recently enacted to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 88-394) is a provision to authorize the Commission to sell nuclear materials to the Euratom Community. Sales during 1965 are currently estimated at \$11 million, but were not included in preparing the 1965 budget estimates. The committee recommends increasing the amount of revenues applied by \$11 million, for a total amount of \$47,066,000.

#### PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$400, 000, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....           | 370, 000, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 363, 000, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 363, 000, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$363 million for "Plant and capital equipment," which is \$7 million below the budget estimate.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATION

The committee is of the opinion that in comparing costs for award of contracts for displacement of existing utility services, recognition should be given to all costs normally borne by nongovernmental suppliers.

### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

|                               |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1964 limitation.....          | \$429, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 450, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 450, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 450, 000   |

The committee recommends \$450,000 the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. The increase of \$21,000 is required primarily for the civil service employees, as a result of the last pay act. No increase in the present level of employment is contemplated.

The committee has reduced the authority granted in the House bill, "to expend not to exceed \$6,000 for official entertainment expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator of the Corporation," to the \$2,000 recommended in the budget, and the amount approved last year.



## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 1964.....      | \$47, 142, 000 |
| Estimate, 1965.....           | 50, 915, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 47, 915, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 47, 915, 000   |

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$47,915,000 for the programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority which are supported by appropriations, which is \$3 million below the budget estimate.

In agreeing to the amount of \$5 million appropriated to the "Land Between the Lakes" demonstration program, the committee also agrees with the House in expecting the TVA to use all possible care to maintain good public relations in the land acquisition program.

The committee feels that the acquisition of the land should proceed with due care. Some questions have been raised, however, as to how the recreation and park areas should be administered, and the committee requests that at the hearings on the 1966 budget full information be supplied as to how the area will be developed, the agency that will operate, and the detailed legal authority for all phases of the project.

## DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

|                               |           |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 1964 appropriation.....       | \$38, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 39, 000   |
| House allowance.....          | 39, 000   |
| Committee recommendation..... | 39, 000   |

The committee recommends \$39,000 the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

Funds appropriated under this head are required to provide for the expenses of the U.S. member and the salary and expenses of his alternate and staff. The increase above the 1964 level in this program is to cover pay act increases and travel costs.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

|                               |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1964 appropriation.....       | \$117, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 92, 000    |
| House allowance.....          | 92, 000    |
| Committee recommendation..... | 92, 000    |

The committee recommends \$92,000 the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. The amount recommended is \$25,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1964, this reduction is possible due to the fact that carryover money is being used to defray part of the 1965 costs. The funds requested are required for participation by the Federal Government in the financing of the operating expenses of the Commission. New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the Federal Government pay 24 percent each toward the operating expenses of the Commission and Delaware pays the remaining 4 percent.

## FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1964 appropriation.....       | \$30, 000, 000 |
| Budget estimate, 1965.....    | 5, 000, 000    |
| House allowance.....          | 4, 000, 000    |
| Committee recommendation..... | 4, 000, 000    |

The committee recommends \$4 million the amount allowed by the House and \$1 million below the budget estimate.

The request included \$2,870,000 for supervision, inspection, accounting and disbursement on projects which will still be under construction during fiscal year 1965; and \$2,130,000 for contingencies on projects presently approved but not yet under construction or not yet completed.

In approving an appropriation of \$4 million the committee has allowed the full \$2,870,000 for administrative expenses and \$1,130,000 for contingencies.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED  
IN THE BILL FOR 1965  
REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS**

| Item                                                                     | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended) | Recommended in House bill, 1965 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with-- |                       |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
|                                                                          |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        | Appropriations, 1964                                      | Budget estimate, 1965 | House bill   |
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL                                      |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY                                                   |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| CEMETERIAL EXPENSES                                                      |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                               | \$10,800,000         | \$13,295,000                       | \$13,295,000                    | \$13,295,000                           | +\$2,495,000                                              |                       |              |
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL                                                 |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| General investigation.....                                               | 19,115,000           | 19,795,000                         | 20,590,000                      | 22,269,000                             | +3,154,000                                                | +\$2,474,000          | +\$1,679,000 |
| Construction, general.....                                               | 827,146,500          | 899,108,000                        | 905,767,200                     | 942,791,200                            | +115,644,700                                              | +43,683,200           | +37,024,000  |
| Operation and maintenance, general.....                                  | 3 155,700,000        | 158,676,000                        | 158,676,000                     | 158,676,000                            | +2,976,000                                                |                       |              |
| Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies.....          | (4)                  | 4,150,000                          | 4,150,000                       | 4,150,000                              | +4,150,000                                                |                       |              |
| General expenses.....                                                    | 15,000,000           | 15,575,000                         | 15,575,000                      | 15,575,000                             | +575,000                                                  |                       |              |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....                    | 77,862,000           | 71,860,000                         | 73,550,000                      | 79,920,000                             | +2,088,000                                                | +8,060,000            | +6,370,000   |
| U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.....           | 10,000               |                                    |                                 |                                        | -10,000                                                   |                       |              |
| Total, rivers and harbors and flood control.....                         | 1,094,833,500        | 1,169,164,000                      | 1,178,308,200                   | 1,223,381,200                          | +128,547,700                                              | +54,217,200           | +45,073,000  |
| THE PANAMA CANAL                                                         |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| Canal Zone Government:                                                   |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                           |                       |              |
| Operating expenses.....                                                  | 25,725,000           | 1 29,088,000                       | 29,088,000                      | 29,088,000                             | +3,363,000                                                |                       |              |
| Capital outlay.....                                                      | 6,500,000            | 4,821,000                          | 4,821,000                       | 4,821,000                              | -1,679,000                                                |                       |              |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses..... | (9,285,000)          | (10,639,000)                       | (10,639,000)                    | (10,639,000)                           | (+1,354,000)                                              |                       |              |
| Total, the Panama Canal.....                                             | 32,225,000           | 33,909,000                         | 33,909,000                      | 33,909,000                             | +1,684,000                                                |                       |              |
| Total, title I.....                                                      | 1,137,858,500        | 1,216,368,000                      | 1,225,512,200                   | 1,270,585,200                          | +132,726,700                                              | +54,217,200           | +45,073,000  |



## TITLE II--DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Construction (supplemental, 1965).-

Total, National Park Service.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

## General investigations.

## Construction and rehabilitation.

## Operation and maintenance.

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts) -

Loan program.

Emergency fund...

Upper Colorado River storage project.

General administrative expenses.

Total, Bureau of Reclamation.

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

## Construction

## Operation and maintenance.

Total, Bonneville Power Administration.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## Operation and maintenance.

## SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## Construction...

## Operation and maintenance.

Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Total, Southwestern Power Administration -

Total, title II\_

See footnotes at end of table, p. 45.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Con.*

### REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

| Item                                                                                   | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended) | Recommended in House bill, 1965 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with— |                       |               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                        |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        | Appropriations, 1964                                     | Budget estimate, 1965 | House bill    |
| TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION                                                     |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                          |                       |               |
| Operating expenses.....                                                                | \$2,342,669,000      | \$2,323,000,000                    | \$2,261,073,000                 | \$2,268,008,000                        | —\$74,661,000                                            | —\$54,992,000         | + \$6,935,000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                                              | (31,574,000)         | (36,066,000)                       | (36,066,000)                    | (47,066,000)                           | (+15,492,000)                                            | (+11,000,000)         | (+11,000,000) |
| Plant and capital equipment.....                                                       | 400,000,000          | 370,000,000                        | 363,000,000                     | 363,000,000                            | —37,000,000                                              | —7,000,000            | -----         |
| Total, Title III, Atomic Energy Commission.....                                        | 2,742,669,000        | 2,693,000,000                      | 2,624,073,000                   | 2,631,008,000                          | —111,661,000                                             | —61,992,000           | +6,935,000    |
| TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES                                                           |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                          |                       |               |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expense..... | (429,000)            | (450,000)                          | (450,000)                       | (450,000)                              | (+21,000)                                                | -----                 | -----         |
| Tennessee Valley Authority.....                                                        | 47,142,000           | 50,915,000                         | 47,915,000                      | 47,915,000                             | 773,000                                                  | —3,000,000            | -----         |
| Delaware River Basin Commission:                                                       |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                          |                       | -----         |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                             | 38,000               | 39,000                             | 39,000                          | 39,000                                 | +1,000                                                   | -----                 | -----         |
| Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission.....                               | 117,000              | 92,000                             | 92,000                          | 92,000                                 | —25,000                                                  | -----                 | -----         |
| Total, Delaware River Basin Commission.....                                            | 155,000              | 131,000                            | 131,000                         | 131,000                                | —24,000                                                  | -----                 | -----         |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT                                                    |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                          |                       |               |
| Public works acceleration.....                                                         | 30,000,000           | 5,000,000                          | 4,000,000                       | 4,000,000                              | —26,000,000                                              | —1,000,000            | -----         |
| Total, title IV—Independent offices.....                                               | 77,297,000           | 56,046,000                         | 52,046,000                      | 52,046,000                             | —25,251,000                                              | —4,000,000            | -----         |
| Grand totals:                                                                          |                      |                                    |                                 |                                        |                                                          |                       |               |
| Total, definite appropriations.....                                                    | 4,367,146,700        | 4,395,914,000                      | 4,281,134,200                   | 4,387,278,200                          | +20,131,500                                              | —8,635,800            | +106,144,000  |
| Total, indefinite appropriations.....                                                  | 40,094,000           | 44,835,000                         | 44,835,000                      | 55,835,000                             | +15,741,000                                              | +11,000,000           | +11,000,000   |
| Grand total, all titles.....                                                           | 4,407,240,700        | 4,440,749,000                      | 4,325,969,200                   | 4,443,113,200                          | +35,872,500                                              | +2,364,200            | +117,144,000  |

- <sup>1</sup> Reflects increase in H. Doc. 309.  
<sup>2</sup> Reflects reductions in H. Doc. 240 and H. Doc. 309 and increase of \$19,800,000 in S. Doc. 90.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes \$1,700,000 in Public Law 88-317.  
<sup>4</sup> Funds for this activity were included with "Operations and maintenance, general" appropriation in fiscal year 1964.  
<sup>5</sup> Reflects reduction of \$706,000 in H. Doc. 309 and increase of \$3,300,000 in S. Doc. 89.  
 ○
- <sup>6</sup> Reflects transfer to Bureau of Land Management of \$303,000 in Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1964.  
<sup>7</sup> Reflects reduction of \$81,000 in H. Doc. 240.  
<sup>8</sup> Reflects reduction of \$1,263,000 in H. Doc. 309.  
<sup>9</sup> Reflects increase of \$45,200,000 in S. Doc. 89.  
<sup>10</sup> Includes \$340,000 in Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1964.





# H. R. 11579

[Report No. 1326]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 17 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AUGUST 5, 1964

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4        in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal  
5        year ending June 30, 1965, for certain civil functions admin-  
6        istered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal,  
7        certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the  
8        Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway

1 Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority,  
2 and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for other  
3 purposes, namely:

4 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

5 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

6 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by  
9 law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of  
10 national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers  
11 for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor  
12 vehicles; maintenance of that portion of Congressional  
13 Cemetery to which the United States has title, Con-  
14 federate burial places under the jurisdiction of the De-  
15 partment of the Army, and graves used by the  
16 Army in commercial cemeteries; \$13,295,000: *Pro-*  
17 *vided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair  
18 more than a single approach road to any national cemetery:  
19 *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obli-  
20 gated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family  
21 quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such  
22 limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as  
23 may be required to provide office space, public comfort  
24 rooms, or space for the storage of Government property  
25 within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimburse-



1 ment shall be made to the applicable military appropriation  
2 for the pay and allowances of any military personnel per-  
3 forming services primarily for the purposes of this appro-  
4 priation.

#### 5 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

6 The following appropriations shall be expended under  
7 the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the super-  
8 vision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions  
9 of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and har-  
10 bors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

#### 11 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

12 For expenses necessary for the collection and study of  
13 basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood con-  
14 trol, shore protection, and related projects, and when author-  
15 ized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authoriza-  
16 tion for construction, ~~\$20,590,000~~ \$22,269,000, to remain  
17 available until expended: *Provided*, That \$210,000 of this  
18 appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish  
19 and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports  
20 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
21 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife  
22 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
23 nated with other features of water-resource development  
24 programs of the Department of the Army.

## CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction) ; ~~\$905,767,200~~ \$942,-791,200, to remain available until expended, of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir project; and of which not to exceed \$131,500 shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports

1 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
2 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife  
3 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
4 nated with other features of water-resource development  
5 programs of the Department of the Army.

6           **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL**

7       For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation,  
8 maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood con-  
9 trol, and related works, including such sums as may be neces-  
10 sary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a  
11 State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor  
12 lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and  
13 navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of  
14 operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the  
15 Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commis-  
16 sion; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navi-  
17 gable waters; surveys and charting of northern and north-  
18 western lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straighten-  
19 ing channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation;  
20 \$158,676,000, to remain available until expended.

21           **FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION**

22                           **EMERGENCIES**

23       For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hur-  
24 ricane and shore protection activities, as authorized by section



1 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 8 18, 1941, as  
 2 amended, \$4,150,000, to remain available until expended:  
 3 *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore  
 4 appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with  
 5 this appropriation.

#### 6 GENERAL EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for general administration and  
 8 related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and  
 9 offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of  
 10 Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal En-  
 11 gineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and mis-  
 12 cellaneous investigations; \$15,575,000.

#### 13 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

14 For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood  
 15 control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance  
 16 of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as  
 17 authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), ~~\$73,550,000~~  
 18 \$79,920,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations in this title shall be available for ex-  
 21 penses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in  
 22 the manner authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of  
 23 July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances there-  
 24 for, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as  
 25 amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during

1 a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports author-  
2 ized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed  
3 during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustra-  
4 tions, as documents of the next succeeding session of Con-  
5 gress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund,  
6 Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to  
7 exceed one hundred and sixty-seven for replacement only)  
8 and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

9 THE PANAMA CANAL  
10 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT  
11 OPERATING EXPENSES

12 For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone  
13 Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the  
14 Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or  
15 allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September  
16 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; expenses incident to  
17 conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special  
18 training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as  
19 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) ; contingencies  
20 of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and  
21 support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of  
22 indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including  
23 expenses of their deportation when practicable; maintaining  
24 and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the  
25 Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and payments

1 of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the  
2 Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions,  
3 \$29,088,000.

#### 4 CAPITAL OUTLAY

5 For acquisition of land and land under water and acqui-  
6 sition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities,  
7 structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code,  
8 Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of  
9 not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles of which  
10 nine are for replacement only, and of which twelve are for  
11 police-type use without regard to the general purchase price  
12 limitation for the current fiscal year; improving facilities of  
13 other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal  
14 Zone Government use; and expenses incident to the retire-  
15 ment of such assets; \$4,821,000, to remain available until  
16 expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation  
17 under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation  
18 Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used  
19 for expenses related to the construction of quarters of non-  
20 U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding \$16,500.

#### 21 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

#### 22 CORPORATION

23 The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to  
24 make such expenditures within the limits of funds and bor-  
25 rowing authority available to it and in accordance with



law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$10,639,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which eighteen are for replacement only, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding \$30,000:

1 *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100  
2 per diem.

## 3 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### 4 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

#### 5 CONSTRUCTION

6 *For an additional amount for "Construction" for the*  
7 *purposes set forth in the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat.*  
8 *885), \$1,800,000.*

### 9 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

10 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-  
11 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of  
12 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof  
13 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that  
14 Bureau, as follows:

#### 15 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

16 For engineering and economic investigations of proposed  
17 Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conserva-  
18 tion and development plans and activities preliminary to the  
19 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-  
20 justment, or extension of existing projects, including not to  
21 exceed ~~\$400,000~~ \$450,000 for investigations of projects in  
22 Alaska, to remain available until expended, ~~\$10,354,000~~  
23 \$12,404,000, of which ~~\$9,054,000~~ \$11,054,000 shall be de-  
24 rived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived  
25 from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That

1 none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-  
2 half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State,  
3 municipality, or other interest: *Provided further*, That \$370,-  
4 000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United  
5 States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations,  
6 and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife  
7 Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide  
8 that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration  
9 and be coordinated with other features of water-resource de-  
10 velopment programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

11 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

12 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-  
13 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmis-  
14 sion facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized  
15 by law, to remain available until expended, ~~\$182,433,000~~  
16 ~~\$185,689,000~~, of which ~~\$80,000,000~~ \$83,030,000 shall be  
17 derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no  
18 part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the  
19 construction of transmission facilities within those areas  
20 covered by power wheeling service contracts which in-  
21 clude provision for service to Federal establishments and  
22 preferred customers, except those transmission facilities  
23 for which construction funds have been heretofore ap-  
24 propriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry  
25 out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which



1 the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is  
2 unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal  
3 projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred  
4 customer: *Provided further, That not to exceed \$2,000,000*  
5 *as proposed in Senate Document 89, Eighty-eighth Congress,*  
6 *for maintaining suitable water quality in the Colorado River*  
7 *shall be nonreimbursable: Provided further, That no funds*  
8 *shall be made available under this appropriation for the*  
9 *construction in Contra Costa County, California, of any por-*  
10 *tion of the interceptor drain in connection with the San Luis*  
11 *Unit which terminates at any point east of Port Chicago:*  
12 *Provided further, That not to exceed \$26,000 shall be avail-*  
13 *able for reimbursement to the city of Malta, Montana, for the*  
14 *cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities*  
15 *adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department*  
16 *of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and non-*  
17 *returnable: Provided further, That not to exceed \$200,000*  
18 *of funds made available for improvement of access roads in*  
19 *the Weber Basin project area shall be nonreimbursable.*

#### 20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

21 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects  
22 or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law;  
23 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands  
24 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pur-

1 suant to law, \$40,219,000, of which \$30,758,000 shall be  
2 derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,605,000 shall be  
3 derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That  
4 funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance  
5 of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to  
6 the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the  
7 same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated  
8 herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of  
9 such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the  
10 next succeeding fiscal year.

#### 11 LOAN PROGRAM

12 For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies  
13 for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal  
14 reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Fed-  
15 eral agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by  
16 the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-  
17 421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-422k), as  
18 amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for  
19 carrying out the program, \$12,307,000 to remain avail-  
20 able until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under  
21 the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended,  
22 not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the  
23 making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the con-  
24 tract is entered into shall be made only on the same con-

1 ditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August  
2 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

## EMERGENCY FUND

4        *To reimburse the emergency fund authorized by the Act*  
5        *of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052), for expenses incurred*  
6        *for repair of flood damage to irrigation facilities of the*  
7        *Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects,*  
8        *\$1,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965.*

# UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, \$62,300,000, of which \$57,800,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and \$4,500,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.



## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$10,400,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

## SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administra-

1 tive Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special  
2 fund from which derived.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be  
5 available for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger  
6 motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
7 for replacement only; payment of claims for damage to or  
8 loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activi-  
9 ties of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as other-  
10 wise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons  
11 on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-  
12 ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiating  
13 and administration of interstate compacts without reimburse-  
14 ment or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for in-  
15 formation or evidence concerning violations of law involving  
16 property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation;  
17 performance of the functions specified under the head "Opera-  
18 tion and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclama-  
19 tion, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945;  
20 preparation and dissemination of useful information including  
21 recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies  
22 of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and  
23 recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such  
24 areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August  
25 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) : *Provided*, That no part

1 of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant  
2 to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses  
3 other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation  
4 projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and  
5 amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and gen-  
6 eral engineering and research under the head "General In-  
7 vestigations".

8 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the  
9 appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilita-  
10 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those  
11 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under  
12 the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization  
13 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head  
14 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations  
15 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the de-  
16 velopment of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may  
17 be expended through or in cooperation with State and other  
18 Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby  
19 authorized.

20 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the  
21 performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Rec-  
22 lamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner  
23 provided by law.

24 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-



1 mation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which  
2 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but  
3 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,  
4 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,  
5 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this para-  
6 graph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the  
7 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

8 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation  
9 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from  
10 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular  
11 benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation  
12 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,  
13 or (c) of any individual when such district, organization,  
14 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in  
15 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into  
16 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the  
17 Bureau of Reclamation.

18 Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the  
19 appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work  
20 by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit  
21 and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or  
22 no acceptable bid has been received and, other than other-  
23 wise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to  
24 meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the  
25 construction allotment for any project from the appropria-

tion "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

### CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, ~~\$41,220,000~~ \$87,420,000, to remain available until expended.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$14,980,000.

### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation

1 for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Ad-  
2 ministration shall be available for construction work by force  
3 account or on a hired-labor basis.

4           SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

5                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

6       For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
7 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
8 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
9 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
10 the southeastern power area, including purchase of one  
11 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,000,000.

12           SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

13                   CONSTRUCTION

14       For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
15 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative  
16 expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions  
17 of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C.  
18 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, ~~\$2,~~  
19 ~~640,000~~ \$2,440,000, to remain available until expended.

20                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

21       For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
22 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
23 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
24 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
25 the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to



1 exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only,  
2 \$1,680,000.

3 CONTINUING FUND

4 Not to exceed \$4,500,000 shall be available during the  
5 current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in  
6 connection with the purchase of electric power and energy,  
7 and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available  
10 for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office),  
11 with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency recon-  
12 struction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utili-  
13 ties, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by  
14 fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*,  
15 That no funds shall be made available under this authority  
16 until funds specifically made available to the Department of  
17 the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

18 SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
19 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
20 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
21 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
22 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-  
23 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the  
24 Interior.

25 SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available

1 for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facili-  
2 ties, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to  
3 efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be re-  
4 imbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the  
5 same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932  
6 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs  
7 of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services ren-  
8 dered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
9 time such reimbursements are received.

10 SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this  
11 Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made  
12 available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any pur-  
13 poses other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the  
14 Southwestern Power Administration.

### 15 TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

#### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in  
18 carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
19 as amended, including the employment of aliens; services  
20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
21 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft;  
22 publication and dissemination of atomic information; pur-  
23 chase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment  
24 expenses (not to exceed \$30,000) ; reimbursement of the  
25 General Services Administration for security guard services;

1 hire of passenger motor vehicles; ~~\$2,261,073,000~~ \$2,268,-  
2 008,000, and any moneys (except sums received from dis-  
3 posal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act  
4 of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301) ) received by the Commission,  
5 notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised  
6 Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until ex-  
7 pended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be  
8 expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such  
9 case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the  
10 expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the  
11 nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum  
12 therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*,  
13 That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made  
14 to other agencies of the Government for the performance of  
15 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such  
16 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the  
17 appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That  
18 no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with  
19 the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of con-  
20 tractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or con-  
21 tracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee  
22 for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000  
23 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system  
24 where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.



## 1 PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

2 For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law,  
3 in connection with the purchase and construction of plant  
4 and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses  
5 incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of  
6 the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the  
7 acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any  
8 facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or  
9 expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and  
10 eighty-four for replacement only (including three at not to  
11 exceed \$3,000 each), and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
12 and purchase of one aircraft; \$363,000,000, to remain avail-  
13 able until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed  
14 \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an  
15 isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appro-  
16 priation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission deter-  
17 mines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrange-  
18 ment for construction of all or a part of such plant by private  
19 industry.

## 20 GENERAL PROVISIONS

21 Any appropriation available under this or any other Act  
22 to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used  
23 subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year  
24 1965 to finance the procurement of materials, services,  
25 or other costs which are a part of work or activities for

1 which funds have been provided in any other appropriation  
2 available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate  
3 transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall  
4 subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual  
5 application determined in accordance with generally accepted  
6 accounting principles.

7 Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made avail-  
8 able for the fiscal year 1965 for "Operating expenses"  
9 and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred  
10 between such appropriations, but neither such appropria-  
11 tion, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased  
12 by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and  
13 any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Ap-  
14 propriations Committees of the House and Senate.

15 No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to  
16 confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is  
17 a member of an organization or party that advocates the  
18 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
19 or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds,  
20 upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commis-  
21 sion on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that  
22 reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal  
23 to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any  
24 person who advocates or who is a member of an organiza-  
25 tion or party that advocates the overthrow of the Govern-

1 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts  
2 employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant,  
3 or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation con-  
4 tained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
5 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
6 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
7 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substi-  
8 tution for, any other provisions of existing law.

#### 9 TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### 10 SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

11 The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation  
12 is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the  
13 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such  
14 Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such con-  
15 tracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limita-  
16 tions as provided by section 104 of the Government Corpora-  
17 tion Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in  
18 carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the  
19 current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as herein-  
20 after provided.

##### 21 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT 22 LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

23 Not to exceed \$450,000 shall be available for  
24 administrative expenses which shall be computed on an



1 accrual basis, including not to exceed ~~\$6,000~~ \$2,000 for  
2 official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the  
3 approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allow-  
4 ances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as  
5 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as author-  
6 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
7 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day:  
8 *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for  
9 services of individuals employed at rates in excess of \$50  
10 per day.

#### 11 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

##### 12 PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

13 For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the  
14 Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16  
15 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and  
16 operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed two  
17 hundred and eight for replacement only) and hire of pas-  
18 senger motor vehicles, \$47,915,000, to remain available  
19 until expended.

#### 20 DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

##### 21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
23 United States member of the Delaware River Basin Com-  
24 mission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$39,000.

## 1 CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

2 For payment of the United States share of the current  
3 expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as au-  
4 thorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$92,000.

## 5 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## 6 PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

7 For an additional amount for expenses necessary to  
8 enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes  
9 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541), in-  
10 cluding services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals  
12 not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$4,000,000.

## 13 TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## 14 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

15 SEC. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the  
16 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year  
17 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
18 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor  
19 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed  
20 at \$1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum  
21 shall be \$1,950.

22 SEC. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in  
24 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation  
25 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United

1 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of  
2 which is owned by the Government of the United States)  
3 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such  
4 person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person  
5 in the service of the United States on the date of enactment  
6 of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a  
7 declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United  
8 States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes alle-  
9 giance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland  
10 or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States  
11 for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose  
12 of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall  
13 be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of  
14 this section with respect to his status have been complied  
15 with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false  
16 affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction,  
17 shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not  
18 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
19 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in sub-  
20 stitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided*  
21 *further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee  
22 contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable  
23 in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not  
24 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to  
25 nationals of those countries allied with the United States in



1 the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of  
2 translators, or to temporary employment in the field service  
3 (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

4 SEC. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments  
5 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,  
6 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the  
7 activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters  
8 allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with  
9 title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

10 SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current  
11 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid  
12 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or  
13 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to  
14 approve the nomination of said person.

15 SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in  
16 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used  
17 to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future  
18 volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such  
19 volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the under-  
20 standing that latest published cumulative annual pocket  
21 parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished  
22 free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the  
23 current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest,  
24 or in excess of \$6.50 per volume for the current or future  
25 volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

1        SEC. 506. Funds made available by this or any other  
2 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of  
3 the corporations and agencies subject to the Government  
4 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),  
5 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds  
6 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Colum-  
7 bia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of  
8 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and the objects specified  
9 under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applica-  
10 ble to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise speci-  
11 fied in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*,  
12 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative  
13 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other  
14 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be  
15 correspondingly reduced.

16        SEC. 507. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July  
17 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including cur-  
18 rencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be  
19 used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appro-  
20 priations are made for the current fiscal year (including the  
21 carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of  
22 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to  
23 the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency  
24 concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange  
25 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may

1 be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar  
2 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law,  
3 without reimbursement to the Treasury.

4 SEC. 508. During the current fiscal year, any foreign  
5 currencies held by the United States which have been or  
6 may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activi-  
7 ties of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treas-  
8 ury in unfunded accounts.

9 SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
10 or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure  
11 by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or  
12 propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legisla-  
13 tion pending before Congress.

14 This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appro-  
15 priation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives June 16, 1964.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*





[Report No. 1326]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

JUNE 17 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964

Read twice and referred to the Committee on

Appropriations

AUGUST 5, 1964

Reported with amendments

Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

1       On page 4, line 13, after the word "expended" insert:  
2       ", and of which not to exceed \$131,500 shall be available  
3       for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower  
4       Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby  
5       authorized".

**Amdt. No. 1195**



**Amdt. No. 1195**

**Calendar No. 1263**

**88TH CONGRESS  
2D Session**

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

**AUGUST 6, 1964**

**Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed**







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D.C. 20250

Official business

Postage and fees paid

U. S. Department of Agriculture

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

Issued  
For actions of

Aug. 10, 1964  
Aug. 7 & 8, 1964  
88th-2nd; Nos. 153  
and 154

|                            |                            |                         |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Administrative             | Electrification.....27     | Public Law 480.....36   |
| conference.....27          | Farm program.....5         | Public works.....2      |
| Administrative law.....15  | Feed relief.....16         | Reclamation.....2,14,25 |
| Agricultural               | Foreign agriculture.....32 | Rice exports.....10     |
| appropriations.....1,17    | Foreign aid.....3,18       | Riverways.....27        |
| Alaska relief.....12,21    | Housing.....27             | Strip mining.....20     |
| Appropriations... 1,2,23   | Labeling.....27            | Tariff.....26           |
| Area redevelopment...13,28 | Legislative program...27   | Trade.....33            |
| Beef exports.....19        | Marketing.....8            | Transportation.....7    |
| Commissions.....34,35      | Meat imports.....27,31     | Wheat program.....30    |
| Conservation.....6         | Military construction...23 | Wilderness.....11       |
| Containers.....27,37       | Personnel.....22           |                         |
| Crop insurance.....4       | Poverty.....9,24,29,34     |                         |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed agricultural appropriation bill. House passed poverty bill. Senate passed public works appropriation bill. Senate debated foreign-aid authorization bill. Sen. Miller inserted editorial criticizing administration's farm program. Rep. Poage introduced Public Law 480 bill.

## SENATE - August 7

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 11202 (S. Rept. 1331). Attached to this Digest is the committee report, which includes a statement of committee actions. p. 17886
2. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 11579 (pp. 17895-936). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 17936). Rejected, 23-57, an amendment by Sen. Nelson to reduce reclamation work by \$1,500,000 (p. 17922).

3. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on H. R. 11380, the foreign-aid authorization bill. pp. 17937-47
4. CROP INSURANCE. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, including a provision to remove the ceiling on appropriations; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee. pp. 17885, 18037
5. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Miller inserted and commended an editorial by Dick Hanson criticizing the administration's farm program. p. 17949
6. CONSERVATION. Sen. Mansfield inserted an article stating that this Congress may be known as "The Conservation Congress." p. 17856
7. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Cotton inserted and commended an article by Ben Kelley indicating a belief that the "freight-car shortage" is a myth. pp. 17888-9
8. MARKETING. Sen. McGee inserted a letter from the River Markets Group, Nebr., commending the work of Sen. McGovern in connection with the bill to establish the National Commission on Food Marketing. p. 17950

HOUSE - August 7

9. POVERTY. Concluded debate on H. R. 11377, the poverty bill. By a 228-190 vote, agreed to an amendment by Rep. Landrum to substitute the text of S. 2642, a similar bill, with several modifications. During consideration in Committee of the Whole, adopted a motion to strike out the enacting clause, by a 170-135 vote. Then reversed this action by a record vote of 197-225. pp. 17972-18025
10. RICE EXPORTS. Rep. Thompson, Tex., spoke against plans for the Common Market to impose a tariff on U. S. long-grain rice. p. 17953
11. WILDERNESS. House conferees were appointed on S. 4, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 18025
12. ALASKA RELIEF. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2881, to provide assistance to Alaska for reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent earthquake. p. 18026
13. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Talcott criticized administration of the ARA program and referred to a recent GAO report on this matter. p. 18029  
The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 1163, to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. p. 18037
14. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2337, to authorize construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin reclamation project, Idaho (H. Rept. 1715). p. 18037
15. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 1664, to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the U. S. p. 18037
16. FEED RELIEF. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12115, to fix penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress and for preservation of foundation herds (H. Rept. 1720). p. 18037



88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 7, 1964

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal  
5       year ending June 30, 1965, for certain civil functions admin-  
6       istered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal,  
7       certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the



1 Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway  
2 Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority,  
3 and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for other  
4 purposes, namely:

5 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

6 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

7 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by  
10 law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of  
11 national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers  
12 for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor  
13 vehicles; maintenance of that portion of Congressional  
14 Cemetery to which the United States has title, Con-  
15 federate burial places under the jurisdiction of the De-  
16 partment of the Army, and graves used by the  
17 Army in commercial cemeteries; \$13,295,000: *Pro-*  
18 *vided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair  
19 more than a single approach road to any national cemetery:  
20 *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obli-  
21 gated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family  
22 quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such  
23 limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as  
24 may be required to provide office space, public comfort  
25 rooms, or space for the storage of Government property

1 within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimburse-  
 2 ment shall be made to the applicable military appropriation  
 3 for the pay and allowances of any military personnel per-  
 4 forming services primarily for the purposes of this appro-  
 5 priation.

#### 6 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

7 The following appropriations shall be expended under  
 8 the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the super-  
 9 vision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions  
 10 of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and har-  
 11 bors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

#### 12 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

13 For expenses necessary for the collection and study of  
 14 basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood con-  
 15 trol, shore protection, and related projects, and when author-  
 16 ized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authoriza-  
 17 tion for construction, (1)~~\$20,590,000~~ \$22,269,000, to re-  
 18 main available until expended: *Provided*, That \$210,000 of  
 19 this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish  
 20 and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports  
 21 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
 22 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife  
 23 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
 24 nated with other features of water-resource development  
 25 programs of the Department of the Army.

## CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction) ; ~~(2)\$905,767,200 \$942,-~~ 791,200, to remain available until expended, ~~(3)~~of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir project ~~(4)~~; and of which not to exceed \$131,500 shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: Provided further, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports



1 thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination  
2 Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife  
3 conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordi-  
4 nated with other features of water-resource development  
5 programs of the Department of the Army.

6 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

7 For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation,  
8 maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood con-  
9 trol, and related works, including such sums as may be neces-  
10 sary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a  
11 State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor  
12 lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and  
13 navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of  
14 operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the  
15 Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commis-  
16 sion; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navi-  
17 gable waters; surveys and charting of northern and north-  
18 western lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straighten-  
19 ing channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation;  
20 \$158,676,000, to remain available until expended.

21 FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION

22 EMERGENCIES

23 For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hur-  
24 ricane and shore protection activities, as authorized by section

1 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August (5)8 18, 1941,  
 2 as amended, \$4,150,000, to remain available until expended:  
 3 *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore  
 4 appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with  
 5 this appropriation.

#### 6 GENERAL EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for general administration and  
 8 related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and  
 9 offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of  
 10 Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal En-  
 11 gineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and mis-  
 12 cellaneous investigations; \$15,575,000.

#### 13 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

14 For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood  
 15 control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance  
 16 of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as  
 17 authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), (6)\$63,-  
 18 550,000 \$79,920,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations in this title shall be available for ex-  
 21 penses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in  
 22 the manner authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of  
 23 July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances there-  
 24 for, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as  
 25 amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during

1 a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports author-  
2 ized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed  
3 during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustra-  
4 tions, as documents of the next succeeding session of Con-  
5 gress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund,  
6 Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to  
7 exceed one hundred and sixty-seven for replacement only)  
8 and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

9 THE PANAMA CANAL

10 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

11 OPERATING EXPENSES

12 For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone  
13 Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the  
14 Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or  
15 allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September  
16 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; expenses incident to  
17 conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special  
18 training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as  
19 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) ; contingencies  
20 of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and  
21 support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of  
22 indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including  
23 expenses of their deportation when practicable; maintaining  
24 and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the  
25 Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and payments



1 of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the  
2 Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions,  
3 \$29,088,000.

#### 4 CAPITAL OUTLAY

5 For acquisition of land and land under water and acqui-  
6 sition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities,  
7 structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code,  
8 Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of  
9 not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles of which  
10 nine are for replacement only, and of which twelve are for  
11 police-type use without regard to the general purchase price  
12 limitation for the current fiscal year; improving facilities of  
13 other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal  
14 Zone Government use; and expenses incident to the retire-  
15 ment of such assets; \$4,821,000, to remain available until  
16 expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation  
17 under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation  
18 Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used  
19 for expenses related to the construction of quarters of non-  
20 U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding \$16,500.

#### 21 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

#### 22 CORPORATION

23 The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to  
24 make such expenditures within the limits of funds and bor-  
25 rowing authority available to it and in accordance with

1 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
2 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
3 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended  
4 (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the  
5 programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year  
6 for such corporation, including maintaining and improving  
7 facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone  
8 for Panama Canal Company use.

9 LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

10 Not to exceed \$10,639,000 of the funds available to the  
11 Panama Canal Company shall be available during the cur-  
12 rent fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of  
13 the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and  
14 guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis.  
15 Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operat-  
16 ing expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to  
17 exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which  
18 eighteen are for replacement only, and for uniforms or allow-  
19 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,  
20 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

21 GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

22 The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ  
23 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
24 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding \$30,000:

1 *Provided, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100*  
 2 *per diem.*

## 3 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### 4 (7) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

#### 5 CONSTRUCTION

6 *For an additional amount for "Construction" for the*  
 7 *purposes set forth in the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat.*  
 8 *885), \$1,800,000.*

### 9 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

10 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-  
 11 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of  
 12 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof  
 13 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that  
 14 Bureau, as follows:

#### 15 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

16 For engineering and economic investigations of proposed  
 17 Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conserva-  
 18 tion and development plans and activities preliminary to the  
 19 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-  
 20 justment, or extension of existing projects, including not to  
 21 exceed (8) ~~\$400,000~~ \$450,000 for investigations of projects  
 22 in Alaska, to remain available until expended, (9) ~~\$10,354,-~~  
 23 ~~000~~ \$12,404,000, of which (10) ~~\$9,054,000~~ \$11,054,000  
 24 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000  
 25 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund:



1 *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be used for  
 2 more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested  
 3 by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further*,  
 4 That \$370,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to  
 5 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, in-  
 6 vestigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and  
 7 Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to  
 8 provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal con-  
 9 sideration and be coordinated with other features of water-  
 10 resource development programs of the Bureau of  
 11 Reclamation.

#### 12 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

13 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-  
 14 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmis-  
 15 sion facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized  
 16 by law, to remain available until expended, ~~(11)\$182,433,-~~  
 17 ~~000 \$185,689,000~~, of which ~~(12)\$80,000,000~~ ~~\$83,030,000~~  
 18 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That  
 19 no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the  
 20 construction of transmission facilities within those areas  
 21 covered by power wheeling service contracts which include  
 22 provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred  
 23 customers, except those transmission facilities for which con-  
 24 struction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those  
 25 facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such

1 contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the  
 2 Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to  
 3 provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service  
 4 to a Federal establishment or preferred customer(13): *Pro-*  
 5 *vided further, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 as proposed*  
 6 *in Senate Document 89, Eighty-eighth Congress, for main-*  
 7 *taining suitable water quality in the Colorado River shall*  
 8 *be nonreimbursable: Provided further, That no funds shall*  
 9 *be made available under this appropriation for the construc-*  
 10 *tion in Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of*  
 11 *the interceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit*  
 12 *which terminates at any point east of Port Chicago(14):*  
 13 *Provided further, That not to exceed \$26,000 shall be avail-*  
 14 *able for reimbursement to the city of Malta, Montana, for the*  
 15 *cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities*  
 16 *adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department*  
 17 *of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and non-*  
 18 *returnable(15): Provided further, That not to exceed*  
 19 *\$200,000 of funds made available for improvement of access*  
 20 *roads in the Weber Basin project area shall be non-*  
 21 *reimburable.*

#### 22 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

23 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects  
 24 or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law;  
 25 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands

1 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pur-  
2 suant to law, \$40,219,000, of which \$30,758,000 shall be  
3 derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,605,000 shall be  
4 derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That  
5 funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance  
6 of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to  
7 the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the  
8 same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated  
9 herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of  
10 such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the  
11 next succeeding fiscal year.

#### 12 LOAN PROGRAM

13 For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies  
14 for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal  
15 reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Fed-  
16 eral agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by  
17 the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-  
18 421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-422k), as  
19 amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for  
20 carrying out the program, \$12,307,000 to remain avail-  
21 able until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under  
22 the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended,  
23 not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the  
24 making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the con-  
25 tract is entered into shall be made only on the same con-



1     ditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August  
2     4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

3                                 **(16)EMERGENCY FUND**

4             *To reimburse the emergency fund authorized by the Act*  
5     *of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052), for expenses incurred*  
6     *for repair of flood damage to irrigation facilities of the*  
7     *Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects,*  
8     *\$1,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965.*

9                                 **UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT**

10            For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as au-  
11   thorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to  
12   remain available until expended, \$62,300,000, of which  
13   \$57,800,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado  
14   River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of  
15   April 11, 1956, and \$4,500,000 shall be available for con-  
16   struction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities author-  
17   ized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of  
18   the Department through or in cooperation with State or other  
19   Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are  
20   hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein  
21   appropriated shall be available for construction or operation  
22   of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering  
23   any National Monument.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$10,400,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

## SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administra-

1 tive Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special  
2 fund from which derived.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be  
5 available for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger  
6 motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
7 for replacement only; payment of claims for damage to or  
8 loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activi-  
9 ties of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as other-  
10 wise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons  
11 on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-  
12 ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiating  
13 and administration of interstate compacts without reimburse-  
14 ment or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for in-  
15 formation or evidence concerning violations of law involving  
16 property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation;  
17 performance of the functions specified under the head "Opera-  
18 tion and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclama-  
19 tion, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945;  
20 preparation and dissemination of useful information including  
21 recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies  
22 of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and  
23 recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such  
24 areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August  
25 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467): *Provided*, That no part



1 of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant  
2 to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses  
3 other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation  
4 projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and  
5 amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and gen-  
6 eral engineering and research under the head "General In-  
7 vestigations".

8 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the  
9 appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilita-  
10 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those  
11 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under  
12 the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization  
13 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head  
14 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations  
15 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the de-  
16 velopment of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may  
17 be expended through or in cooperation with State and other  
18 Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby  
19 authorized.

20 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the  
21 performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Rec-  
22 lamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner  
23 provided by law.

24 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-

1 mation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which  
2 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but  
3 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,  
4 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,  
5 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this para-  
6 graph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the  
7 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

8       No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation  
9 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from  
10 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular  
11 benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation  
12 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,  
13 or (c) of any individual when such district, organization,  
14 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in  
15 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into  
16 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the  
17 Bureau of Reclamation.

18       Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the  
19 appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work  
20 by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit  
21 and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or  
22 no acceptable bid has been received and, other than other-  
23 wise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to  
24 meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the  
25 construction allotment for any project from the appropria-

tion "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

### CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, (17) ~~\$41,220,000~~ \$87,420,000, to remain available until expended.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$14,980,000.

### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation



1 for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Ad-  
2 ministration shall be available for construction work by force  
3 account or on a hired-labor basis.

4 SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

6 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
7 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
8 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
9 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
10 the southeastern power area, including purchase of one  
11 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,000,000.

12 SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

13 CONSTRUCTION

14 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,  
15 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative  
16 expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions  
17 of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C.  
18 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,  
19 \$2,610,000, to remain available until expended.

20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

21 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of  
22 power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power  
23 and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the  
24 Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to  
25 the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to

1 exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only,  
2 \$1,680,000.

3 CONTINUING FUND

4 Not to exceed \$4,500,000 shall be available during the  
5 current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in  
6 connection with the purchase of electric power and energy,  
7 and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available  
10 for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office),  
11 with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency recon-  
12 struction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utili-  
13 ties, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by  
14 fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*,  
15 That no funds shall be made available under this authority  
16 until funds specifically made available to the Department of  
17 the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

18 SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
19 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
20 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
21 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
22 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-  
23 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the  
24 Interior.

25 SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available

1 for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facili-  
2 ties, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to  
3 efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be re-  
4 imbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the  
5 same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932  
6 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs  
7 of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services ren-  
8 dered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
9 time such reimbursements are received.

10 SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this  
11 Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made  
12 available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any pur-  
13 poses other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the  
14 Southwestern Power Administration.

### 15 TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

#### 16 OPERATING EXPENSES

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in  
18 carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
19 as amended, including the employment of aliens; services  
20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
21 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft;  
22 publication and dissemination of atomic information; pur-  
23 chase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment  
24 expenses (not to exceed \$30,000) ; reimbursement of the  
25 General Services Administration for security guard services;



1 hire of passenger motor vehicles; ~~(18)\$2,261,073,000~~ \$2,-  
2 268,008,000, and any moneys (except sums received from  
3 disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community  
4 Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301) ) received by the Commission,  
5 notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised  
6 Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until ex-  
7 pended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be  
8 expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such  
9 case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the  
10 expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the  
11 nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum  
12 therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*,  
13 That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made  
14 to other agencies of the Government for the performance of  
15 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such  
16 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the  
17 appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That  
18 no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with  
19 the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of con-  
20 tractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or con-  
21 tracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee  
22 for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000  
23 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system  
24 where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

## PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and eighty-four for replacement only (including three at not to exceed \$3,000 each), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of one aircraft; \$363,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrangement for construction of all or a part of such plant by private industry.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for

1 which funds have been provided in any other appropriation  
2 available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate  
3 transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall  
4 subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual  
5 application determined in accordance with generally accepted  
6 accounting principles.

7 Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made avail-  
8 able for the fiscal year 1965 for "Operating expenses"  
9 and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred  
10 between such appropriations, but neither such appropria-  
11 tion, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased  
12 by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and  
13 any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Ap-  
14 propriations Committees of the House and Senate.

15 No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to  
16 confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is  
17 a member of an organization or party that advocates the  
18 overthrow of the Government of the United States by force  
19 or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds,  
20 upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commis-  
21 sion on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that  
22 reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal  
23 to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any  
24 person who advocates or who is a member of an organiza-  
25 tion or party that advocates the overthrow of the Govern-



1 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts  
2 employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant,  
3 or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation con-  
4 tained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,  
5 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not  
6 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
7 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substi-  
8 tution for, any other provisions of existing law.

#### 9 TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### 10 SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

11 The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation  
12 is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the  
13 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such  
14 Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such con-  
15 tracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limita-  
16 tions as provided by section 104 of the Government Corpora-  
17 tion Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in  
18 carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the  
19 current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as herein-  
20 after provided.

##### 21 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT 22 LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

23 Not to exceed \$450,000 shall be available for  
24 administrative expenses which shall be computed on an

1 accrual basis, including not to exceed ~~(19)\$6,000~~ \$2,000 for  
2 official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the  
3 approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allow-  
4 ances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as  
5 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as author-  
6 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.  
7 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day:  
8 *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for  
9 services of individuals employed at rates in excess of \$50  
10 per day.

#### 11 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

##### 12 PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

13 For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the  
14 Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16  
15 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and  
16 operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed two  
17 hundred and eight for replacement only) and hire of pas-  
18 senger motor vehicles, \$47,915,000, to remain available  
19 until expended.

#### 20 DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

##### 21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
23 United States member of the Delaware River Basin Com-  
24 mission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$39,000.

## 1 CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

2 For payment of the United States share of the current  
3 expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as au-  
4 thorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$92,000.

## 5 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

## 6 PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

7 For an additional amount for expenses necessary to  
8 enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes  
9 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541), in-  
10 cluding services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of  
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals  
12 not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$4,000,000.

## 13 TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## 14 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

15 SEC. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the  
16 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year  
17 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
18 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor  
19 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed  
20 at \$1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum  
21 shall be \$1,950.

22 SEC. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-  
23 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in  
24 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation  
25 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United



1 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of  
2 which is owned by the Government of the United States)  
3 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such  
4 person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person  
5 in the service of the United States on the date of enactment  
6 of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a  
7 declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United  
8 States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes alle-  
9 giance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland  
10 or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States  
11 for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose  
12 of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall  
13 be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of  
14 this section with respect to his status have been complied  
15 with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false  
16 affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction,  
17 shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not  
18 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the  
19 above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in sub-  
20 stitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided*  
21 *further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee  
22 contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable  
23 in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not  
24 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to  
25 nationals of those countries allied with the United States in

1 the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of  
2 translators, or to temporary employment in the field service  
3 (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

4 SEC. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments  
5 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,  
6 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the  
7 activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters  
8 allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with  
9 title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

10 SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current  
11 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid  
12 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or  
13 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to  
14 approve the nomination of said person.

15 SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in  
16 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used  
17 to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future  
18 volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such  
19 volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the under-  
20 standing that latest published cumulative annual pocket  
21 parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished  
22 free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the  
23 current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest,  
24 or in excess of \$6.50 per volume for the current or future  
25 volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

1        SEC. 506. Funds made available by this or any other  
2 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of  
3 the corporations and agencies subject to the Government  
4 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),  
5 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds  
6 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Colum-  
7 bia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of  
8 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and the objects specified  
9 under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applica-  
10 ble to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise speci-  
11 fied in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*,  
12 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative  
13 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other  
14 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be  
15 correspondingly reduced.

16        SEC. 507. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July  
17 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including cur-  
18 rencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be  
19 used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appro-  
20 priations are made for the current fiscal year (including the  
21 carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of  
22 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to  
23 the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency  
24 concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange  
25 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may



1 be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar  
2 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law,  
3 without reimbursement to the Treasury.

4 SEC. 508. During the current fiscal year, any foreign  
5 currencies held by the United States which have been or  
6 may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activi-  
7 ties of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treas-  
8 ury in unfunded accounts.

9 SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this  
10 or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure  
11 by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or  
12 propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legisla-  
13 tion pending before Congress.

14 This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appro-  
15 priation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives June 16, 1964.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate with amendments August 7, 1964.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,  
*Secretary.*



## AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 7, 1964

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the  
Senate numbered



# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1        On page 4, line 13, after the word "expended" insert:
- 2        " , of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment
- 3        and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Tele-
- 4        phone Company to permit continued service to the present
- 5        users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir
- 6        project".

**Amdt. No. 1196**

**Calendar No. 1263**

**88TH CONGRESS**  
**2D SESSION**

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

August 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1       On page 11, line 25, after the words "Port Chicago"
- 2       insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further, That*
- 3       not to exceed \$26,000 shall be available for reimbursement
- 4       to the city of Malta, Montana, for the cost of improvements
- 5       to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under
- 6       the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in that city
- 7       to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable".

**Amdt. No. 1197**



**Amdt. No. 1197**

**Calendar No. 1263**

88TH CONGRESS  
2D Session

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

August 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1       On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete “\$942,791,200” and
- 2       insert in lieu thereof “\$941,491,200”.

**Amdt. No. 1201**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROxmIRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

**August 6, 1964**

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1       On page 11, line 25, after the words "Port Chicago"
- 2       insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That not
- 3       to exceed \$200,000 of funds made available for improvement
- 4       of access roads in the Weber Basin project area shall be
- 5       nonreimbursable".

**Amdt. No. 1198**

**Amdt. No. 1198**

**Calendar No. 1263**

**88TH CONGRESS  
2d Session**

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

**AUGUST 6, 1964**

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

1       On page 11, line 21, after the word "customer" insert  
2   a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That not to  
3   exceed \$2,000,000 as proposed in Senate Document 89,  
4   Eighty-eighth Congress, for maintaining suitable water  
5   quality in the Colorado River shall be nonreimbursable".

**Amdt. No. 1199**



# **H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

August 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**Amdt. No. 1200**

**Amdt. No. 1200**

**Calendar No. 1263**

**88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION**

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

**AUGUST 6, 1964**

**Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed**



Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete "\$942,791,200" and
- 2 insert in lieu thereof "\$942,561,200".

Amdt. No. 1203

**Amdt. No. 1203**

**Calendar No. 1263**

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROxmIRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 1263

88TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11579

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 6, 1964

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

---

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete “\$942,791,200” and insert in lieu thereof “\$942,126,200”.

**Amdt. No. 1202**



**Amdt. No. 1202**

**Calendar No. 1263**

**88TH CONGRESS  
2d Session**

**H. R. 11579**

---

## **AMENDMENT**

---

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROxmRE to H.R. 11579, an Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

---

**AUGUST 6, 1964**

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Are these mysterious hospitals expensive? The 1,900 hospitals already in place cost the American taxpayers some \$38 million. Each of the new 750 hospitals is costing some \$45,000. In other words, assuming no increase in costs—a highly dubious assumption—our total investment in these hospitals will run to nearly \$400 million. Other estimates are as much as twice the amount.

These are, of course, only the initial investment costs. Rental charges are an additional cost. Moreover, these hospitals deteriorate, even without use. Drugs lose their potency, rubber cracks, and so on. It is estimated that through this means, about 1 percent of the initial investment is lost, each year. So, naturally, in this other world, such losses have to be made up by further Federal expenditures. The General Services Administration uses manpower to visit once a year each of these hospitals without patients. All deteriorated items are thrown away, and new products replace them—adding more expense, but, of course, no more service, because there was no service to begin with.

Mr. President, the other world I am describing is the world of civil defense. I think it is a world we might wish to look at. Virtually no thoroughgoing examination has been made of this world, despite the fact that it exists, it is mushrooming, and the expansion is being generated with taxpayer dollars.

First of all, Mr. President, I think we should consider whether we need this other world. Of course, the answer is we need everything. But I do not believe we have asked ourselves whether we need these expenditures on civil defense more than we need the benefits that could come from other uses of these funds, including such uses as the possible retirement of some of our national debt.

Let me make clear that I do not question all necessary expenditures for defense. But in the civilian area, there are so many other threats against civilians that seem so much more real and immediate than the threat of outside aggression. There are, to name just one area, the threats of illness and injury. Funds spent now for hospitals without patients could be spent for the direct treatment of these illnesses and injuries, through private insurance plans or by other means. There are, of course, many other alternatives.

Moreover, the threat to which civil defense expenditures are addressed is both vague and nebulous, whereas the other social dangers are more clear and pressing. What type of civil defense do we need? No one knows. Surely, therefore, we should not attempt to throw up every type of bulwark we can think of, against possibilities that are far less real than the needs within our own community.

Why should we follow a policy of sterilizing these funds, so that no peaceful use can be made of them? Consider the case of the crated hospitals: It would seem obvious that if they are not to be simply a form of crude subsidy to the producers of hospital supplies, who at present are the only ones who benefit from the purchases, then the hospital

equipment should be used, not buried and allowed to rust or rot. The only parallel I know to this kind of waste is the subsidy we pay gold producers to take gold out of the ground, so the Government can put it back into the ground at Fort Knox.

Does the policy of using these hospital supplies make sense, in case of atomic attack? Of course. Where will the injured go after an attack, except to a hospital? It can be argued that the hospitals will be destroyed. But there is the same likelihood that the warehouses with the crated hospitals will be destroyed. Hospital equipment in hospitals can be dispersed just as easily as the same equipment in crates can. But it may be alleged that small dispersed hospitals at present do not have the standby capacity to handle all the injured. This argument does not stand up. First, it is well known that 70 percent of inpatients in hospitals at any one time could be removed from the hospitals in case of emergency. Second, many past emergencies have shown the amazingly expendable capacity of our hospitals. Third, if the problem is one of having sufficient trained personnel and organization, what good will crates in a warehouse be? Finally, it would seem doubtful that any of us, if injured, would have the omniscience to go to a warehouse, regardless of how crowded a hospital might be.

But now let us consider the infinitely longer period of time when there will be no atomic attack. During all this time, we would follow the wasteful policy of having hospital equipment, but not using it, even though the need for the equipment exists. The logical approach would be to put the equipment in hospitals, not in crates; and to use the equipment to provide services, not just to consume space.

If a hospital shortage existed, clearly these supplies would help alleviate it. The financial burden on small community hospitals—which, incidentally, are rather effectively dispersed—would be eased.

Drugs and other perishables could be rotated and used, rather than be ruined or destroyed. How will an adequate inventory be assured in case of attack? One way would be to check the hospital inventories, instead of, as now, checking the crates. Another—and even simpler—way would be to require the drug companies, which thus far have been getting this subsidy, to maintain higher inventories, which could be sent to particular locations in time of need.

Mr. President, I strongly urge both Houses of Congress to examine this question. In addition, I intend to vote against the appropriation of any further funds for civil defense purposes—for the purchase of these mystery hospitals—until a study of the reasonableness of this program has been made.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1263, H.R. 11579.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before the Senate for consideration is the bill that deals with moneys appropriated for the civil functions of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the TVA, and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior including the Bureau of Reclamation. I am very hopeful that consideration of the bill can be concluded this afternoon, so that, as soon as possible, we may go to conference with the House on the disagreeing amendments.

The bill passed the House on June 16, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on June 17. The bill was reported to the Senate on August 5.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of the bill. The report on it is on the desks of the Senators, and I believe it quite clearly sets forth the action of the committee.

Except for two or three items, I believe the bill is noncontroversial. I expect that amendments will be offered to decrease amounts recommended for certain public works projects.

At the conclusion of my statement, I will ask that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, so that the Senate will have ample opportunity to work its will on the bill.

Mr. President, as is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three subcommittees for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, and the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The hearings on this bill started on March 23, and continued through July



7, 1964. The subcommittee held 41 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and 4 executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 1,186 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations; 539 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army; 520 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The remaining 127 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The hearings comprise four volumes, which contain 3,658 pages of testimony. Senators have a complete set of them on their desks. They constitute the basic information upon which the subcommittee based its recommendation to the full committee.

It will be recalled that last year I stated it was my belief that in the future the committee should, in a measure, curtail much of the repetitious testimony that is given from year to year on the continuing projects. I am pleased to report that as a result of my appeal to the witnesses to confine their testimony on continuing projects to new matters, the length of the civil functions portion of the hearings was reduced by 102 pages. The committee received all of the information required for its action and, at the same time, saved the taxpayers considerable expense.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, before marking up the civil functions portion of this bill, we reviewed every project that was presented to the subcommittee, budgeted or unbudgeted. We examined into every single request made of the subcommittee for planning or construction. After all the requests were made, the engineers were called back to obtain their views on the projects presented to the subcommittee. The purpose of this recall was to find out whether the engineers could eco-

nomically and efficiently utilize the additional funds requested by the local witnesses, and whether the Corps of Engineers had the capability to undertake the unbudgeted new starts requested.

As in the past, the subcommittee heard all the witnesses who desired to present testimony on unbudgeted projects, and also on budgets for which more funds were asked than were budgeted. The same is true of surveys and new planning starts. As in the past, there is not a single project that has been recommended by the subcommittee or by the committee as a whole for which there is not justification in the hearings before the Senate.

I am proud to say that the subcommittee has not included, either in this instance or in the past, any projects that were not completely justified by the Corps of Engineers, and as to which their capability was not clearly shown.

As to projects that were requested and that were budgeted, the subcommittee spent considerable time reviewing them with the Engineers.

The Senate has before it a complete justification for all planning and construction projects that were included in the bill by the Senate committee, and all projects that were recommended by the House as well.

In order to balance the bill, and in order to take care of worthy areas not previously included in the bill, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects that had been requested by witnesses from all over the country, and by Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives. I hope that the Senate will agree to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be possible to retain the majority of the projects in the conference with the House.

At this point I wish to repeat that all the new projects and new starts, both in construction and in engineering, that were recommended by the House were

adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee. So I am hopeful that, in conference, the House will agree to the few projects the Senate committee put in the bill. I believe that never since the year I became chairman of the subcommittee have the House and Senate been so close, both moneywise and in the number of projects recommended by both Houses. So I do not anticipate much trouble in conference with the House.

The House committee added 17 unbudgeted construction projects and 15 unbudgeted planning items. The House reduced the budget for construction, general, by \$6,610,000; of which \$5 million was an increase in the item reduction for savings and slippage.

As we all know, many projects are delayed because the engineers or the local people may have difficulty in obtaining sufficient land on which to build projects, or rights-of-way to construct roads. It is normal that over the years this slippage has amounted to from 4 to 5 percent of the overall amount provided by the bill. The engineers have advised that the budgeted amount for slippage is the maximum reduction without jeopardizing the construction programed.

In title I, the Senate committee considered a budget estimate of \$19,800,000 which was submitted to the Senate after the House had acted on the bill. Senate increases to the revised budget, including restoration of the \$5 million for slippage, account for \$19,800,000 of the \$37,024,000 increase recommended for construction generally.

The Senate committee recommended \$630,000 for 9 unbudgeted planning items and \$5,089,000 for 14 unbudgeted construction projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table explaining the committee action on title I.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### *Title I—Civil functions, Department of the Army*

|                                                           |                            |                                                                     |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Cemeterial expenses.....                                  | \$13,295,000               | Corps of Engineers—Continued                                        |               |
| The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House. |                            | Operation and maintenance.....                                      | \$158,676,000 |
| Corps of Engineers:                                       |                            | The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.           |               |
| General investigations.....                               | 22,269,000                 | Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies.....     | 4,150,000     |
| Above the budget.....                                     | \$2,474,000                | The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.           |               |
| Above the House, including restoration of \$1,-           |                            | General expenses.....                                               | 15,575,000    |
| 000,000 for slippage.....                                 | 1,679,000                  | The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.           |               |
| Above 1964.....                                           | 3,154,000                  | Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....               | 79,920,000    |
| Construction, general.....                                | 1 <sup>a</sup> 942,791,200 | Above the budget.....                                               | \$8,060,000   |
| Increases to budget estimate in-                          |                            | Above the House.....                                                | 6,370,000     |
| cluding restoration of House                              |                            | Above 1964.....                                                     | 2,058,000     |
| cut, of which \$5,000,000 is for                          |                            | Canal Zone Government:                                              |               |
| slippage.....                                             | \$19,800,000               | Operating expenses.....                                             | 29,088,000    |
| 9 new planning starts.....                                | 630,000                    | The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.           |               |
| 14 new construction starts.....                           | 1 <sup>b</sup> 5,089,000   | Capital outlay.....                                                 | 4,821,000     |
| 28 House-approved items raised.....                       | 11,635,000                 | The budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.           |               |
| 2 House items reduced.....                                | -130,000                   | Total, title I.....                                                 | 1,270,585,200 |
| Total.....                                                | 37,024,000                 | Above the budget.....                                               | \$54,217,200  |
| Above the House.....                                      | \$37,024,000               | Above the House.....                                                | 45,073,000    |
| Above the budget.....                                     | 2 <sup>a</sup> 43,683,200  | Above 1964.....                                                     | 128,547,700   |
| Above 1964.....                                           | 115,644,700                |                                                                     |               |
| House compared with the budget                            |                            | 1 <sup>a</sup> New future commitments are as follows:               |               |
| prior to revision of July 30, 1964, S.                    |                            | <sup>a</sup> New future commitment.....                             | \$370,552,000 |
| Doc. 90:                                                  |                            | <sup>b</sup> New future commitment for 35 new starts in budget..... | 511,267,000   |
| 15 new planning starts.....                               | 1,047,000                  | <sup>c</sup> New future commitment.....                             | 199,609,000   |
| 17 new construction starts.....                           | 1 <sup>b</sup> 11,952,000  |                                                                     |               |
| 13 increases in budget items.....                         | 20,070,200                 | Total new commitment.....                                           | 1,081,428,000 |
| 3 budget items reduced.....                               | -6,610,000                 |                                                                     |               |
| Total.....                                                | 26,459,200                 | 2 <sup>a</sup> Includes \$26,329,200 added by the House.            |               |
| House bill above budget.....                              | 26,459,200                 |                                                                     |               |



## Summary by titles

|                                                 |                 |                                    |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Title I—Civil Functions, Department of the Army | \$1,270,585,200 | Title III—Atomic Energy Commission | \$2,631,008,000 |
| Above the budget                                | \$54,217,200    | Above the House                    | \$6,935,000     |
| Above the House                                 | 45,073,000      | Below the budget                   | 61,992,000      |
| Above 1964                                      | 128,547,700     | Below 1964                         | 111,661,000     |
| Title II—Department of the Interior             | 387,913,000     | Title IV—Independent offices       | 52,046,000      |
| Above the House                                 | 8,410,000       | Compared with the House            | Same            |
| Below the budget                                | 42,587,000      | Below the budget                   | \$4,000,000     |
| Below 1964                                      | 21,409,200      | Below 1964                         | 25,251,000      |
| Items deferred for later consideration:         |                 | Grand total all titles             | 4,397,387,200   |
| Reimbursement to city of Malta,                 |                 | Above the House                    | \$71,418,000    |
| Mont                                            | \$26,000        | Below the budget                   | 43,361,800      |
| Weber Basin project road                        | 200,000         | Below 1964                         | 9,853,500       |
| Pacific Northwest-Pacific South-                |                 |                                    |                 |
| west intertie                                   | 45,500,000      |                                    |                 |
| Total                                           | 45,726,000      |                                    |                 |

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimates provided for 35 new construction starts. I commend the administration for taking such action. The projects recommended are all necessary, and it is essential that each year an adequate number of new construction projects be added to the program if the national needs for the development of our water resources are to be met in an orderly and efficient manner.

## TITLE II

Mr. President, title II deals primarily with reclamation projects and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior. As I have said, it was handled for the committee by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The committee considered budget estimates for the Department of the Interior agencies amounting to \$430,500,000, plus \$5,300,000 in reprogramming requests. Of this, \$53,800,000 was transmitted to Congress after the House had passed the bill.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$433,639,000, including the reprogrammed amounts. The largest addition to the House bill, of course, is \$45,500,000 for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest electric intertie. Provision is made for initiating construction of three of the four lines recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

The recommendation for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie is one of the two items which I question the advisability of undertaking at this time.

The committee also recommends funds to accomplish emergency construction work for the National Park Service, for weather modification research, for an engineering office for the Bureau of Reclamation, for tile drains to improve the quality of water going to Mexico through the Colorado River, and for additional work on the Central Valley and Columbia Basin projects.

Reductions from budget estimates have been recommended in connection with transmission facilities in the Central Valley project, in the Missouri River Basin, and in the Southwestern Power Administration area.

## TITLE III

Mr. President, the committee recommended \$2,631,008,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee recommendation is \$17,935,000 above the House, which is offset by an increase of \$11 million in operating revenues for a net increase in appropriated funds of \$6,935,000; \$61,992,000 below the budget; and \$111,661,000 below the appropriation for 1964.

## ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For operating expenses, the committee recommended an increase of \$17,935,000, of which \$6,435,000 was for the reactor development program; \$8 million was for physical research; and \$3.5 million for special nuclear materials. For plant and capital equipment, the committee recommended \$363 million, the amount allowed by the House and \$7 million below the estimate.

## TITLE IV

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, the committee recommends \$47,915,000, the amount allowed by the House and \$3 million below the budget estimate. Included in the recommended appropriation is \$5 million for the Land Between the Lakes demonstration program. This is an item in which I am personally opposed.

There is a substantial question as to whether this development is authorized. The question is a factual one. If the development is, in fact, simply a study, experiment, or demonstration "necessary and suitable" to the making of plans useful to Congress and the several States under section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, it would appear to be authorized by that section. If, however, the recreation area is, in fact, an end objective in itself, not related to the making of plans useful to Congress or the States, or not "necessary and suitable" to the making of such plans, it would not appear to be authorized. I believe their own testimony convicts them on this score.

If this project should be carried forward, it should be carried out by the National Park Service. The advantages claimed for this site should be studied by the appropriate committees of Congress and weighed against the alleged advantages of other sites presently being considered for recreational areas to serve the same area.

Under this same authority, in connection with a future TVA dam and reservoir, the chairman of the Board states that a major objective in the proposed Tellico project will be the development of the reservoir and adjacent lands in such a way as to permit the project to make the maximum possible contribution to the economy of the region. They propose to acquire some 16,500 acres of shoreline lands which extensive studies have shown to be suited for development and use for industry, public and private recreation, and home sites; that detailed plans for the development of the shoreline land be developed in cooperation with appropriate State and local agencies; and that the development plans be

implemented through an orderly schedule of disposal of lands and land rights as the demand arises for industrial sites, home sites, and recreational development sites. This is not something I fear will happen. It is the announced plan of chairman in a letter to a Member of the House of Representatives.

Is it the intent of this Congress to acquiesce in the condemnation of private lands, for subsequent disposal to private interests, according to the whims of a bureaucrat? They could, under this philosophy, acquire private land by condemnation, determine that it was in the interest of the economic development of the TVA area to furnish a plant site free of charge to, say, a textile mill in New England. I, for one, cannot subscribe to this philosophy.

If acquisition and disposal of land is the announced intention of TVA with respect to the Tellico project on the Little Tennessee River, this same Board of Directors could decide to dispose of any or all of the lands in the Between the Lakes area in the same manner. For these and other reasons, I am opposed to the acquisition of land for the Between the Lakes development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Once again I wish to express to the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee, on behalf of the people of my State, appreciation for the fair impartiality with which he handled all the requests of the Senators from Oregon in regard to Oregon projects. He knows as well as I do that there will always be in my State those who will not be happy about some of the exclusions. But I owe it to the Senator from Louisiana and to the members of his committee to say to the people of my State that in a given year we cannot receive favorable action on all of our requests, and that we received fair consideration from the Senator from Louisiana, which is all that any State is entitled to. I am satisfied that in the future, as we present additional information, which obviously will be needed on a few projects to satisfy the Appropriations Committee, we shall continue to receive a decision from the



Senator from Louisiana on the merits of our case.

As a lawyer, I know that sometimes a judge does not place the same weight and value on the evidence submitted to him that counsel places upon it. I wish the people of my State to know that in my years of experience with the Senator from Louisiana I have found him to be a fair and just judge, and I am not at all discouraged, may I say to those in my State who may be disappointed, in regard to our cases in the future before this fair judge. But I wish to say to this judge and to the people supporting the projects that were approved, in respect to those projects that, he did my State justice. And he did my State justice in regard to the cases that he rejected. A lawyer never agrees with a decision that may go against him; therefore I do not agree with the decision of the court in this instance, but I am satisfied that I received judicial treatment, and that is all to which we are entitled.

I want the Senator to know that I shall be back next year pleading my case again. I hope at that time I shall have evidence that will convince the Senator on the Oregon cases. But for the decisions he has rendered in approving the Oregon projects, I thank the Senator sincerely, not only in behalf of myself, but the people of my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is rather difficult to turn down good projects. Of course, it is necessary in many States. We must live within the budget, if possible. We have not always done so in the past. We increased the amount to some extent to more or less balance the bill so as to insure that all States receive their fair share of the funds provided. I do not know whether some worthy projects were overlooked or not, but the committee thought certain projects should be added to the bill.

I am proud to say that this administration has added quite a few new projects, which made our task easier. The House added a few projects, and so did the Senate committee. All in all I think we have a fairly well-balanced bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has our deep appreciation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what was the request?

Mr. ELLENDER. To have the committee amendments agreed to en bloc, and to have the bill then considered as original text.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Subject to further amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 16, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$20,590,000" and insert "\$22,269,000".

On page 4, line 9, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$905,767,200" and insert "\$942,791,200", and in line 10, after the word "expended", to insert "of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir project; and of which not to exceed \$131,500 shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized."

On page 6, line 1, after the word "August", to strike out "8" and insert "18".

On page 6, line 17, after "(33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1)", to strike out "\$73,550,000" and insert "\$79,920,000".

On page 10, after line 3, to insert:

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction' for the purposes set forth in the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885), \$1,800,000."

On page 10, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$450,000"; in line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$10,354,000" and insert "\$12,404,000", and in line 23, after the word "which", to strike out "\$9,054,000" and insert "\$11,054,000".

On page 11, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$182,433,000" and insert "\$185,689,000"; in line 16, after the word "which", to strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert "\$83,030,000"; on page 12, line 4, after the word "customer", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"Provided further, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 as proposed in Senate Document 89, Eighty-eighth Congress, for maintaining suitable water quality in the Colorado River shall be nonreimbursable."

And on page 12, line 11, after the name "Port Chicago", to insert a colon and the following additional provisos:

"Provided further, That not to exceed \$26,000 shall be available for reimbursement to the city of Malta, Montana, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: Provided further, That not to exceed \$200,000 of funds made available for improvement of access roads in the Weber Basin project area shall be nonreimbursable."

On page 14, after line 2, to insert:

"EMERGENCY FUND

"To reimburse the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052), for expenses incurred for repair of flood damage to irrigation facilities of the Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects, \$1,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965."

On page 19, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$41,220,000" and insert "\$87,420,000".

On page 20, line 18, after the word "area", to strike out "\$2,610,000" and insert "\$2,440,000".

On page 23, line 1, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$2,261,073,000" and insert "\$2,268,008,000".

On page 27, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$2,000".

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I also wish to express my

appreciation to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He presided over the hearings on matters relating to the Bureau of Reclamation.

We in Kansas are indebted to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and to the committee—and this is equally true of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]—for the inclusion of very worthy projects in our State.

The Senate is fortunate, and I believe our Nation is fortunate, in having both these Senators serve on this important committee. I know of no Senators who have devoted more time or are better qualified to approve or reject projects when it comes to controlling water runoff and controlling water for beneficial uses, than these two Senators. On behalf of the people of Kansas I express my appreciation to both of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is my privilege to serve as a member of several of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations; but I derive particular satisfaction from serving on the Subcommittee on Public Works.

The projects appropriated for by the bill now before the Senate meet long-standing and rigid standards. They are carried out by well established and experienced agencies including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Every project in the bill has been carefully considered for a long period of time, many of them for several years. They have been carefully examined, not only by the Committee on Appropriations, but also by the Committee on Public Works in some instances, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in others with a view toward determining whether authorization is justified.

These projects provide needed development of our land and water resources, and our atomic resources. This is a bill in which the Senate can take pride, because it is in the classic traditions of a government doing for its people what they cannot do, or do so well, for themselves.

The bill is very close to the amount of the budget request. It is only \$2,364,200 above the budget estimate of \$4,440,749,000. The total definite appropriations come to \$4,387,278,200, which is divided among four titles, as follows:

Title I, civil functions, \$1,270,585,200; title II, Department of the Interior, \$433,639,000; title III, Atomic energy, \$2,631,008,000; and title IV, independent offices, \$52,046,000; or a total of \$4,387,278,200.

Of the increase over the amount appropriated by the House, \$45.5 million is represented by a single item, the item for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie project, to which the chairman of the subcommittee referred. Without this item, the committee's recommendation would be very close to the total amount approved by the other body.

Mr. President, not all of the projects that might have been included in the bill have been. I cite this as evidence



of the rigid standards and requirements which Congress, in its wisdom, has written into the law.

The bill can properly be regarded as an investment in the future of America, because it represents a substantial addition to our capital plant. It is an investment from which we can expect a sizable return. The committee insists on this by demanding a showing of a favorable ratio of benefit to cost.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his careful and concise presentation of this important appropriations bill.

It has, as in past years, been a distinct pleasure to work with him and the other members of the subcommittee.

It has been a difficult year for all committees of the Senate. Throughout the many weeks of debate on the civil rights bill, committees were not permitted to meet during sessions of the Senate, except in emergency situations. This resulted in long delays in hearings and broken schedules.

The situation was particularly acute insofar as the Committee on Appropriations was concerned. It is the one committee which has the critical responsibility of providing adequate funds for the many departments, agencies, and commissions of the Federal Government. And it is the one committee which must constantly meet deadlines imposed by considerations of sound fiscal management.

There is no need for me to discuss each appropriation item and the amounts involved therein, as I am sure the Members of the Senate have been fully informed on this by the lucid and detailed remarks of the committee leadership and by the information contained in the committee report.

The Corps of Engineers phase of the bill is particularly complex. There are numerous surveys and active projects throughout the country involving countless towns and cities, in each State. Due consideration must be given to each project and to the views of all concerned. At the same time close attention must be given to the overall money to be spent. Representatives of the various political subdivisions, as well as private and other nongovernmental organizations are understandably eager to complete their projects as soon as possible.

It is my privilege to serve as ranking minority member on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee as well as the special subcommittee handling appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is chairman of this special subcommittee and he, too, has done a fine job. I want to also commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his expert guidance of the hearings and the executive consideration of the budgetary request of the AEC. His position as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and his membership on the Appropriations Committee provide him with vast knowledge of the various atomic energy programs of the Nation.

There has been one deviation this year from the customary handling of activities by the Atomic Energy Commission. Last year Congress adopted an amendment to the basic act governing various AEC programs. This amendment permitted the Joint Committee, for the first time, to review the entire AEC program, as well as the Commission's budgetary requirements. The Joint Committee is now in the position of being able to make legislative recommendations on any or all of the AEC program, and to suggest to Congress a ceiling on amounts to be allowed the Commission.

Mr. President, I feel that this amended procedure is a sound improvement. It gives Congress a doublecheck on the programs and the spending. I am confident the Commission is also pleased to have this added opportunity to fully review and justify its proposals.

Another major area of this bill is that covering appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies. I shall not go into the activities of these agencies and their requirements, but I do want to pay great tribute to two highly respected and very able gentlemen, our honored and beloved chairman from Arizona, Senator HAYDEN, and our senior and ranking minority member from South Dakota, Senator MUNDT. Their guidance of hearings on budget requests from these agencies moved smoothly and every estimate was handled with complete fairness to all concerned. I know the difficult task they had in consideration of the proposed electric power transmission lines between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

Before I close, Mr. President, I wish to express my special appreciation to the dedicated work of the committee staff, especially Messrs. Kenneth Bousquet and Paul Eaton, of the majority staff, and Mr. Edmund King, of the minority staff. They have, as in the past, provided talented and capable assistance, which we deeply appreciate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1201. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete "\$942,791,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$941,491,200".

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing the floor, to permit me to make a general statement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment there be a limitation of debate of 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side; and that on the other two amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin the time be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to a side, the time on the

amendments to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am content, provided that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas outside my time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Wisconsin not begin to run until I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what the Senator from Wisconsin has asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask that the time on the amendment not run until the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Connecticut have spoken briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators who have complimented the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee for his faithful, diligent, and effective work on this appropriation bill. The program of projects financed by this bill are those which are most vital to the progress, prosperity, and economic growth of our country. They are improvements whose construction have heretofore been authorized—improvements that will strengthen the economy of the Nation. Therefore, they have my wholehearted support.

Experience has proven that this character of projects that have been authorized and appropriated for and which have been constructed or which are now under construction are fully justified economically. The expenditures to be made under this bill are primarily expenditures of investment in the long-range growth and development of our great natural resources and in the conservation and use of the vital water resources of the country.

One reason why I wish to comment on this bill is because it contains an increase in the appropriation for the Arkansas River program. That increase over the House allowance comes about for this reason: In the original budget, the President requested an appropriation of \$84 million for the Arkansas. At that time, because of my support for economy wherever it can be effected, I told the President that we were hopeful that that amount, although it was some \$18 million below what the Corps of Engineers said it could economically expend, could be lived with—that it would be acceptable. However, thereafter, when the Corps of Engineers analyzed the \$84 million and undertook to apply the analysis to the various projects, so as to keep the program on schedule, it was found to be inadequate and that it would be impossible to keep the program advancing and completed as planned by 1970. In other words, the Corps of Engineers found that another \$15 million would be required, and that a total of \$99 million would have to be appropriated for the Arkansas program in order to keep it on schedule and to



meet the target date for completion in 1970.

This situation was analyzed and examined and it was found that a delay of 1 year would occur in the completion of the project, and that the result would be a loss of \$43 million in benefits which would accrue from the 1 year delay in construction and completion of the project. Delaying construction for 1 year would incur a direct cost out of the Treasury of between \$10 million and \$11 million.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the increased cost of purchasing the land that will be inundated would run from \$800,000 to \$1 million.

In addition, it was found that of the 27 counties in Oklahoma and Arkansas through which the river flows, 23 are eligible for area redevelopment funds.

It was also found that the additional money would provide an overall number of 1,320 jobs in this distressed area.

We presented the facts to the President of the United States. I talked with him personally about it on three different occasions in conferences at the White House. When he became convinced, after checking the figures which I have related, the President in his wisdom—and realizing that not to keep the construction on schedule as originally planned would be false economy, and that losses would occur in the manner which I have outlined, plus others, perhaps, to which we have not referred specifically—on July 30 sent forward a supplemental budget estimate which included \$14 million additional for the Arkansas River project.

I wish to express my appreciation to the President for his consideration, and for the consideration which was given by the committee, the chairman of the committee and other members, in accepting the decision of the President. This additional appropriation is more than justified.

I know that it is a wise course. The Federal Government and the Treasury will actually save money by reason of having increased the amount necessary to complete the project on schedule so that the target date for completion by 1970, as heretofore announced, can be met.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter the President transmitted to the President pro tempore of the Senate on July 30, transmitting the supplemental budget to which I have referred, together with the reasons stated therefor.

There being no objection, the letter and supplemental budget were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 30, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress

an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$19,800,000 for the Corps of Engineers.

The details of this request and the necessity therefor are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,  
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
Corps of Engineers—Civil

| Budget appendix page | Heading                    | Request pending | Proposed amendment | Revised request |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 347                  | Construction, general..... | \$879,308,000   | +\$19,800,000      | \$899,108,000   |

The proposed amendment would provide an additional \$14 million for construction work on Arkansas River navigation project in 1965. Recently completed studies indicate that an earlier completion date will result in a substantial increase in benefits by enabling the project to be completed in phase with industrial development plans in the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma. Its construction also provides an important stimulus to economically distressed areas in these States.

The remaining \$5.8 million would be used to maintain construction schedules on the J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn.; on the Perry Reservoir, Kans.; and on an important element of the central and southern Florida project. The added amount will permit earlier realization of significant urban flood control and other project benefits.

The amount requested herein when added to amounts previously requested will not raise total requests above the totals proposed in the 1965 budget.

The amendment is in addition to those transmitted to the Congress on March 9, 1964, House Document No. 240, and on May 28, 1964, House document No. 309.

The foregoing item has been carefully reviewed and I recommend its transmission to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,  
ELMER B. STAATS,  
Acting Director of the  
Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I, too, consulted the President with respect to the items to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred. I stated to the President that I was impressed with the testimony, which showed that if the project were delayed by 1 year, the benefits that would be lost would be, I believe, the estimate was three times more than the additional amount that would be required this year to complete the project by the target date. I jokingly told the President that whether he sent an amended budget estimate to the Congress or not, I would put the additional money in the bill.

[Estimate No. 29, 88th Cong., 2d sess.]  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$19,800,000 for the Corps of Engineers—Civil, as follows:

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator did. The Senator agreed to put it in the bill. I express my appreciation to him also. But again let me say for the record that no special favors were asked.

Mr. ELLENDER. None.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We based the request on the merits of the project, on its benefits to the communities affected and to the area of the country that was being developed, and also on the basis of the impact it would have—

Mr. ELLENDER. In savings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the savings that would be made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes—the savings. It was false economy not to do it—not to add this \$14 million additional. It was prudence and frugality to appropriate it. I talked with the President on three different occasions about it, and when the figures came in, when the Corps of Engineers had reported to the Bureau of the Budget the figures I had given to the President. They were fully substantiated by the Corps of Engineers.

This is an excellent and fully justified project, one that should be expedited to completion without any undue or unnecessary delay.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for permitting me to proceed at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield on the same basis as before to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] without my time being limited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator. I wish to join briefly in the well-deserved words of praise for the chairman of this subcommittee who has been remarkably diligent and at all times most considerate.

As I remember, last March I went to the Senator from Louisiana and recom-



mended that a sum of \$25,000 be appropriated for a study of the Thames River and New London Harbor channel by the Corps of Engineers. He was most gracious and considerate. I wish to thank him for his help. I owe him a debt of gratitude for the interest he took in it.

The Thames River is a vital artery into the heartland of eastern Connecticut. Its course should be thoroughly surveyed in order to properly plan channel improvements for its waterborne traffic.

I am grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for his great help in moving this program forward.

I should like to direct a question to him: Am I to understand that the additional funds recommended by the committee for survey and navigation studies would be available for such a project as the Thames River project?

Mr. ELLENDER. What we have done in the past and what we have done in this case is to approve a lump sum increase for surveys and direct the engineers to apply those increased amounts to surveys which were submitted to the committee. The Senate committee has always followed a policy of not earmarking funds for any particular survey. The Corps of Engineers is authorized to select from among those surveys submitted to the committee, the ones they feel are most urgent. Sometimes, as the Senator may know, they may budget \$25,000 to \$50,000 for a survey, and then, after the Corps of Engineers spends \$3,000 or \$4,000 of that amount, they find out that further work on that survey is not feasible and, therefore, they give it up. We always provide a lump sum to take care of surveys which are presented to the committee and which show some promise.

I assure the Senator that a good case has been made for the study to which he has referred, and I am hopeful that the corps will provide some funds for that study.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the number of my pending amendment 1201?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would eliminate the \$1.3 million which the Corps of Engineers has requested to deepen and widen the harbor at Palm Beach, Fla.

The total cost asked for this project is \$5.6 million, of which \$5.1 million would be Federal funds. The \$1.3 million appropriations request would be to complete the central, or dogleg section of the three-sectioned dredging proposal. My amendment would prohibit funds for any further work on the dogleg, and would halt the project altogether.

I have six reasons for opposing this appropriation. Essentially, all six points lead to the same inescapable conclusion: This project no longer has any justification. Due to certain changes in the local situation at Palm Beach, there is no longer any need to deepen and widen the harbor. Allowing money for going ahead with the dredging would be granting money for a completely useless activity. Furthermore, allowing appropriations for it would be not only spending money for a project which will benefit no one, but would also be funding a program which will actually harm someone. With no positive benefits remaining, only the harmful effects of the dredging would be left.

My first point is that the principal user of oil in Palm Beach harbor is switching to natural gas, thus diminishing the anticipated benefits of the project for petroleum commerce.

The Florida Power & Light Co. is the principal user of the oil delivered to Palm Beach Harbor. The justification of the project in the Senate hearings says in reference to the annual tonnage of oil received by the Palm Beach docks, that:

The increase [in oil tonnage] is due to accelerated enlargement of the local steam-electric plant. \* \* \* Tanker benefits have increased accordingly.

The local steam-electric plant mentioned is the Florida Power & Light facility at Riviera Beach, obvious in pictures of the harbor.

The principal purpose of the Palm Beach project is to deepen the harbor bottom to make it easier for oil tankers to maneuver and unload. The Corps of Engineers justification says on the same page:

The bulk of the benefits [of the project] would accrue to petroleum products commerce. About 80 percent of the vessels entering the harbor with drafts of 23 feet or more are tankers.

The justification claims that 800,000 tons of oil will be received in 1965, 1.4 million tons in 1990.

But, Mr. President, prospective oil receipts in the harbor neglect the fact that F.P. & L. has just recently announced the conversion of 25 percent of their facilities to the use of natural gas, and in the long run plans to convert the whole plant to gas. The news article announcing the conversion to gas in the Miami Herald of June 20, 1964, says:

A company official said long-range plans call for elimination of fuel oil at the 730,000-kilowatt plant, which towers above the Lake Worth shoreline a block north of West Palm Beach.

Richard Hill, the company's division manager, said that a 100-percent conversion was in the works, and that total conversion would take only the completion of a satisfactory contract and the approval of the Federal Power Commission.

Even with the 25 percent oil cutback, though, the figures listed in the Senate hearings, including the benefit-cost ratio, are out of date. The Corps of Engineers has admitted that they have not taken the partial conversion of the F.P. & L. plant into consideration in any new estimate of the Palm Beach project. They

said that they do not plan to refigure the project with the new factor included until next year. Congress now has a set of inaccurate figures justifying this project. The present benefit-cost ratio given is 1.7 to 1. This has been calculated without considering the fact that the Florida Power & Light Co. has reduced its oil use by 25 percent. The 1.7 benefit-cost ratio is figured with 50 years of benefits anticipated and a discount rate of 2½ percent. But, if we were to include the more realistic discount rate of 4 percent, we would find that with the same 50-year life, the benefit-cost ratio would drop to 1.2. This ratio still does not take into consideration the 25-percent cutback in oil shipments, much less the eventual 100-percent elimination of oil by the F.P. & L.

A 1962 report of the Corps of Engineers is the latest we have in the way of statistics about the benefits of the project. It estimates that \$366,000 would be saved by the project in total, \$248,000 of which would accrue to savings in operation of oil tankers. This is 68 percent of the benefits of the project going to petroleum commerce. Now, we learn that petroleum commerce is to be cut 25 percent. This cutback cuts into a large portion of the petroleum commerce of the harbor, which is the principal import there. Furthermore, we have no assurance from the corps that the F.P. & L. facilities will be using oil in the near future. If they discontinue the use of oil, 68 percent of the project benefits is erased.

An added factor is that natural gas is becoming a competitive product with oil in the Palm Beach area.

The prospective supplier of gas to the area, the Florida Natural Gas Co. in Orlando, Fla., has stated that plenty of gas could be made available to the F.P. & L. All the needs of the area could be supplied without much trouble. They are already supplying 25 percent of the F.P. & L. fuel. They further stated that gas costs would not exceed present oil costs. A nearby example of this trend to gas is Fort Pierce, Fla., less than 60 miles from Palm Beach. Fort Pierce has switched to gas completely, gas supplied by the same gas company, Florida Natural Gas, and this switch was made with no change in costs.

With a 100-percent conversion to gas at the Palm Beach powerplant, only \$88,000 are left in projected benefits. Is this worth the \$500,000 to be paid for the project by the port district or the \$5 million spent by the Federal Government?

The Corps of Engineers says that the 25-percent reduction of oil use by the F.P. & L. will not affect the current benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 to 1 very substantially. But this seems to be a questionable claim when we consider these facts:

First. Eighty percent of the vessels with drafts of over 23 feet in the Palm Beach Harbor are tankers. The project is principally for their benefit, since the harbor is already 27 feet deep, and will be deepened to 33 feet.

Second. The 1963 Corps of Engineers report as I have cited claims that 68 percent of the benefits of the project would be savings in tanker costs.



Third. The Senate hearings state that 640,000 tons of oil are expected on the average annually from 1961 to 2010. This means 84 percent of the total tonnage carried to the harbor would be oil. The dry cargo average was 134,000 tons.

Fourth. The Senate hearings furthermore claim that next year, 1965, 630,000 tons of oil alone would be hauled to the docks. This is due to the enlargement of facilities there—see page 662 of the hearings.

Fifth. The corps has also claimed that there are other oil users in the area which would be benefited, besides the F.P. & L. But, when asked how many tons are used by all these users put together, they said that only 120,000 tons were not used by the F.P. & L. in 1962. The oil consumption at F.P. & L. was estimated at 630,000 tons in 1963, so we can infer from that that consumption in 1962 was not much less than 630,000 tons.

Mr. President, these facts indicate that a large percentage of the total commerce going into Palm Beach harbor is oil specifically for the F.P. & L. plant, and thus that a 25-percent cutback in their oil use is significant for the benefit-cost ratio of the project. Consider the effect, moreover, of a 100-percent oil cutback on the benefit-cost ratio.

Is the rest of the benefit for dry cargo shipping? This leads to my second major point.

Dry cargo tonnage has been reduced since the 1959 report justifying the project. The 1959 corps report on the harbor calculated economic feasibility figures which considered heavy railroad car ferry traffic to and from Havana, Cuba, which has now completely ceased.

There is no other ship commerce in need of the harbor deepening. The harbor is now 27 feet deep. Eighty percent of the ships using it which require more than 23 feet are tankers. The deepening was justified largely because a greater depth was needed for larger tankers expected in the future. With the tankers no longer being used because oil is not to be used, the only other ship commerce would be of the dry cargo type. But, the majority of the dry cargo types have been car ferries, which require only 16 to 18 feet in water depth. Even if these still ran between Havana and Palm Beach, they would not need a deeper harbor—see page 23, 1959 Report.

My third point, Mr. President, is that all but one of the communities off the Palm Beach Harbor have passed resolutions against the project.

Resolutions opposing the project have been received from the city councils of Riviera Beach—where the Florida Power & Light Co. is located—West Palm Beach, and Palm Beach Shores. Palm Beach is the only town which has not denounced it formally. While it is true that the Palm Beach Port Commission approved the project by a 2-to-1 vote, the one dissenting vote was cast by the commissioner who is the only one elected by the towns of Palm Beach and Palm Beach Shores, the towns most affected potentially by the project.

I also have statements by owners of local electronics industries which oppose the project.

Fifth, several towns are considering the passage of anti-air-pollution measures, making the use of oil by power companies uneconomical and prohibitive. The Florida Power & Light Co. has admitted that its Riviera Beach plant spews 80 tons of ash a day out from their smokestacks. The air pollution committee of that community has recommended prosecution of the plant for violating air pollution regulations. It was in response to this threatened prosecution that the company has changed part of its facilities to gas. Other towns are contemplating the same type of regulations. Several industries in the area have lined up against the port project on the grounds that it will lead to further air pollution, if oil is continued to be used by the powerplant. This pollution, to their minds, makes it hard to attract people to Palm Beach to work.

Sixth, the project endangers valuable beach property through flooding. Deepening the harbor will make Lake Worth more susceptible to the effects of rising ocean tides. Several spots are especially vulnerable. Tides have risen steadily through the years subsequent to dredging activities. It is true that a study of the University of Florida said that on the basis of testing a model of Palm Beach Harbor, little flooding is likely to occur, for the tides would rise only six-tenths of a foot. But if their calculations are wrong, no provisions are made for those who suffer the loss. And, hurricane flooding was not ever considered.

My last point, Mr. President, is that the project endangers fish and wildlife in the Lake Worth area. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has stated that the turbidity in the water caused by the dredging can chase away many of the sports fish in the Lake Worth area. Their major concern was with the means of disposal of the silt and stone dredged. The spoil—dumping—areas chosen are in locations known to be choice spawning areas for local fish. The Izaak Walton League of the region and State have opposed this project for conservation reasons, as have many other local conservation organizations.

At least, we must oppose these appropriations until further information is given the Congress, including:

First. The benefit-cost ratio of the \$1.3 million dogleg dredging, the various percentages of benefits, and expected tonnages for the Palm Beach Harbor, and so forth, with the 25-percent oil cutback of the F.P. & L. figured in.

Second. An assurance in writing from the F.P. & L. that no further conversion to natural gas is planned within the next 10 years or so, or longer.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request which I would like to add, if granted, to the previous request. I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the agreement previously entered into, there be 30 minutes allowed for all other amendments, and 1 hour on the bill, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the hearings the project to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers was again requested by local delegations from Palm Beach. The committee heard of no opposition to it which would constitute evidence for the RECORD. After conclusion of the hearings, and as soon as the committee received the first information from the opposition, I asked the engineers for their reaction to that opposition. The result of their study was furnished to me on August 4, 1964. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read that letter. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1964.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter inclosing correspondence which you received from Mr. Gene Dyer of Palm Beach, Fla., concerning the Federal project for improving Palm Beach Harbor. Reference also is made to a subsequent telephone request from Mr. Bousquet of the subcommittee staff for the prompt submission of available information.

A continuing contract to initiate dredging of the improvement of Palm Beach Harbor, authorized by the 1960 River and Harbor Act, was awarded by our Jacksonville district engineer on June 17, 1964, with funds appropriated for fiscal year 1964. This contract provides for obtaining project dimensions in the middle section of the channel, including that portion which has been hazardous to navigation. Funds in the amount of \$1,300,000 were included in the 1965 budget for the purpose of completing this initial contract work. The contractor is expected to start test dredging of the channel this week.

The commissioners of the Port of Palm Beach District are the local assurers for the harbor improvement and they furnished those assurances of local cooperation in July 1961. All available evidence also indicates the district's intent to comply with the requirements of the authorizing act. The district has contributed \$152,300 as its matching share of the project cost for work contemplated through fiscal 1965. The port district has purchased a site for additional tank storage capacity and a pipeline easement from the port area to the proposed tank storage area. They also are reported to be seeking prospective users of this storage capacity.

In its report on which authorization of the Palm Beach Harbor improvement was based (H. Doc. 283, 86th Cong.), the corps estimated that the average annual petroleum products tonnage over the 50-year economic life of the project would be 640,000 tons. This tonnage estimate did not include any commerce attributable to the siting of an oil refinery or petrochemical plant in the Palm Beach area and no benefits from such commerce were claimed by the corps then or now. Accordingly, the adoption of resolutions opposing the siting of such industries in Palm Beach County has had no effect on the economic justification of the navigation improvement.

Petroleum products seaborne receipts at Palm Beach Harbor for 1962, amounted to



over 396,000 tons, of which about 81,500 tons were for users other than the Florida Power & Light Co. plant at Riviera. Petroleum tonnage for other users is expected to increase to about 500,000 tons during the economic life of the project. The Florida Power & Light Co. has increased the generating capability of its Riviera plant at a rate faster than was expected at the time the corps was preparing its report in House Document 283, 86th Congress. The projected capability by 1965 was then estimated to be a maximum of 371 megawatts whereas the company increased its capability to 737 megawatts in 1963. A partially offsetting factor to the expected tonnage growth in fuel oil receipts required to serve the increased powerplant capability has recently arisen. This factor was the conversion by the company to the use of 25 percent gaseous fuel on June 19, 1964. According to company officials, the purpose of the conversion to a 25-percent gas operation was because of community protests to the smoke and air pollution resulting from the use of fuel oil alone. The use of the present proportions of 25 percent gas and 75 percent fuel oil is reported to have eliminated the smoke plume. The assistant to the operating vice president of the Florida Power & Light Co. in a letter of July 24, 1964, cited the company's fuel oil needs through 1968, based on use of 25 percent gas fuel, which amounts to more than 530,000 tons annually. A recalculation of the Palm Beach Harbor improvements economic justification on the basis of the partial conversion to gas fuel shows the project to have a ratio of benefits to costs of 1.3 to 1.

In a May 1964 primary election contest for two of the three Port of Palm Beach District commission offices, in which enlargement of the harbor was recognized to be a principal issue, two proponents of the harbor improvement defeated two opponents of that improvement. One of the primary victors is unopposed in the November 1964 election.

The contractor who was awarded the initial dredging contract is expected to dump his dredge spoil at sea if he decides to use a dipper dredge. If he uses a pipeline dredge, he has the option of using either Peanut Island or an area along the south side of the south jetty. These same areas also will be available for disposal of spoil from dredging of the remainder of the improvement. Selection of the spoil areas and the method of deposition has been coordinated with the local sponsors, affected State agencies, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

With regard to any detrimental effects resulting from the harbor improvement, it is considered that such effects would be minor. In this connection, the Fish and Wildlife Service considers that increased turbidity from the dredging process may result in reduced fishing until the sediments have re-stabilized but that this would be a short-term effect. Also, a model study by the University of Florida's Coastal Engineering Laboratory revealed that, under extreme tidal conditions, the maximum rise in Lake Worth due to enlargement of the ship channel would not exceed 0.6 of 1 foot. The average annual damages due to increased tidal flooding from the channel enlargement have been included in our economic evaluation of the project and amount to only \$6,100.

I hope the foregoing information will adequately serve your needs.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. PAGE,

*Colonel, Corps of Engineers*

(For Jackson Graham, Major General,  
U.S. Army, Director of Civil Works).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the record shows that the Palm Beach harbor project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.7, which is a very good ratio. I am sure

that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] can explain to the Senate the merits of this project better than I can. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, or as much time as he desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I speak not only for myself but for my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] on this question.

First, I wish to express our deep appreciation for the enthusiastic interest which the Senator from Wisconsin has shown in our State. We invite him to work over with a fine-tooth comb all Florida projects at any time.

Second, I wish the RECORD to be quite clear on this point. The appropriation in the bill is not all that the engineers stated was their 1965 potentiality for the project. The record shows that the Engineers stated their potentiality was \$2.7 million. The \$1.3 million which we granted is enough to permit the completion of the present contract on which work is under way.

I wish the RECORD to show clearly what that particular contract covers. It covers only section B, or the inner or median section B in the project. That section was begun for a very particular and necessitous reason. There is a so-called dogleg or channel turn in the channel that comes into the harbor, on which two tankers became hung up in the months just prior to the hearings conducted by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

It became clearly evident that the effectiveness of the port to serve the present commerce—not commerce far into the future—was thoroughly jeopardized by the continuance of this jutting out angle into the channel; so the work was provided to be begun last year when we put in an emergency \$250,000, requiring that it be begun in this particular part of the project, and a continuing contract was let, not to cover the entire project, but only this particular part, and the \$1,300,000 which we put in this year is intended to complete that particular part only of the project.

The Senator from Wisconsin is not the only one who is interested in the entire project. Our committee was interested; and when we found that there was continuing opposition, we made the following provisions in our report. I wish them to be in the RECORD:

As a result of these objections, the committee has taken the matter up the Corps of Engineers has been informed that the funds appropriated last year were utilized to initiate a continuing contract for the central portion of the authorized deepening, which includes the dogleg that was the location of several serious groundings last year. The funds requested for fiscal year 1965 are to be utilized for the continuation and completion of the contract now underway. The committee desires that the Corps of Engineers reevaluate the economic justification for this project based on current conditions and be prepared to present up-to-date factual information to the committee at the time of the fiscal year 1966 appropriations hearings.

Mr. President, I do not see how the distinguished chairman of our commit-

tee or the committee itself could have been more careful in its recommendation for the appropriation of this particular amount.

I wish the RECORD to show a little about this port. First, most of the port was locally built. For example, Senators will find on page 663 of the hearings that the engineers testified:

Jetties constructed at the entrance by local interests consist of two parallel rubble-stone structures 800 feet apart; the north jetty and revetment being about 1,800 feet long and the south jetty, 1,700 feet long. The cost of this completed work was \$1,689,000.

Senators will not find many ports in the United States where the local harbor people have paid for both of the jetties. I call that point to the attention of Senators.

Senators will find on page 1283 of the hearings the statement of the total local investment in the harbor to date:

Local investment already exceeds \$5 million.

That demonstrates how interested the people in that area have been in providing a good port.

The next thing I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, but only briefly, is the fact that not only is the Florida Power & Light Co. interested in the port, but also the great Pratt & Whitney plant there, is a large user of oil. Six new sugar plants, in addition to the two that have long been there, are great users of oil and will use oil in greater quantities in the future than in the past. They use it in the process of evaporating sugar cane juice.

The needs of that port are established. They are clear. We believe that next year when hearings on the question are held, the record will be so clear that the committee will be completely justified in continuance of the project.

At this time there is no doubt that this particular item of \$1.3 million is not only justified, but also it is good common-sense to complete the work of removing from the channel the hazard which has already caused serious damage in the case of the grounding of two huge tankers.

Without any further elaboration on the question, I merely wish to say that with reference to the furnishing of gas to the Florida Power & Light Co., that day is not here yet. I wish it were. I wish we could meet in our State the very great needs for natural gas. The trouble is that the one great line that reaches into the Peninsula of Florida cannot supply the present needs of the present applicants. The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and I are continuously besieged by individuals, industries, and municipalities which are trying to obtain gas to convert their local utilities to gas fuel production. We cannot get it because it is not there. It must be brought all the way from the Louisiana or Texas fields. There is a limit to the amount that can be brought through present facilities, it means a great additional investment before the needs of the additional applicants—and I am sure



most of them are completely justifiable—can be met.

So we are not talking about something that can be done tomorrow or next year—we do not know at what time in the future—when we talk about new gas fuel for the greatly increased and expanded Florida Power & Light plant at the port of Palm Beach.

One more word. This trouble started over the desire of some local interests, who have been beaten down for a long time, to put an oil refinery in that area. My colleague and I joined in the insistence that no such thing be done, because it was too close to both vacation and residential areas to justify putting in any such development.

That is not in the picture at this time, and never could be in the picture with the support of the delegation from Florida and with the support of the citizens of that area. It would be manifestly undesirable to put an oil refinery in the midst of that area. But the complaint begun at that time aroused apprehensions, which still exist, and which can best be met by the determined resistance of the two Senators from Florida, the Representative from that district, who lives in Palm Beach, Hon. PAUL ROGERS, and the entire Florida delegation, to putting an oil refinery at that particular place. We would never consent to it.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Senator from Florida is absolutely correct in one respect. The report does ask for a reevaluation of the program but I say we should wait and get the reevaluation before we spend the money. Let us first ask the questions. Let us first get the answers. Then and only then we can spend the money if it is wise. We should not first spend the money and then ask the questions. Local investment is fine. This is a fine harbor. I am not talking about the past, but the future. I am talking about expansion. It is said that possibly Pratt & Whitney and a sugar refinery are going to have a need for oil. I wonder how the people who are subject to the 80 tons of ash from the Florida Power & Light are going to look on such a conversion to oil.

Mr. President, my previously stated objections to this project stand without significant change in any important respects. There is no need for spending millions to dredge this harbor. The purpose, to permit more oil transportation, has disappeared. It is gone. I hope the Senate will look favorably on this amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Florida such time as he needs.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself completely with the remarks made by my distinguished senior colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

I think it is obvious on the face of it that the Senators from Florida have a better understanding of this particular

project than even the industrious Senator from Wisconsin.

I commend and congratulate the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works for the consideration which he has given to this particular project. The statement which is contained in the report sums the matter up completely. It is pointed out that this is a continuing contract. There is a responsibility to go through with it to eliminate the hazards in the harbor, so that present commitments can be lived up to and so that next year, before the budget is made up for 1966, the Corps of Engineers can come in and make a reevaluation of the whole project.

I am confident, in light of what my senior colleague from Florida has said and the confidence the Senate has in the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that the amendment will be soundly defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 20, line 19, to strike out "\$2,440,000" and insert "\$2,610,000."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment would restore \$170,000 covering two items in the House bill. One of them covers \$120,000, affecting a number of towns in southeast Missouri and one town in Arkansas. I shall read from the justification as contained in the sideslips. Incidentally, these items were in the bill as passed by the House, and through an inadvertence in some way, they were not covered in the bill as it came from the Senate committee.

I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HAYDEN], who handled the Southwestern Power Administration features of the bill. I believe he will accept the amendment.

I read from the justification:

Transmission interconnections—Southeast Missouri municipalities, \$120,000.—These funds are the estimated amounts required to complete construction of a 69-kilovolt transmission extension to connect the Government's existing 69-kilovolt line extending to Sikeston substation to the Government's 161/69-kilovolt substation at Idalia and also to initiate construction of 69-kilovolt extensions to provide service to the municipal preference customers of New Madrid, Malden, Campbell, and Piggott from the Jonesboro-Idalia 161-kilovolt line, construction of which has been scheduled for fiscal year 1964.

I also read from the sideslip relating to the \$50,000 item:

Kennett substation, \$50,000: These funds are the estimated amounts required to initiate construction of a 161/69-kilovolt substation on the Jonesboro-Idalia 161-kilovolt

line at or near the city of Kennett, Mo. This substation is planned and will be designed to provide service to the city of Kennett with whom contract negotiations are in progress and, in addition, this substation will be located and designed to provide terminal facilities to permit a 69-kilovolt interconnection for delivery of power and energy to the M. & A. Electric Power Cooperative of Poplar Bluff, Mo., and also to permit 69-kilovolt transmission extensions to certain southeast Missouri municipalities. This project will enable the Government to market additional blocks of hydropower and energy which will produce an estimated annual revenue of \$550,000. The funds requested for this budget year will provide for the purchase of the necessary substation site and the construction of terminal structures for the Jonesboro-Idalia line, the construction and completion of which will precede that of this proposed substation. Funds to complete the construction of this substation will be requested in the following budget year.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], if he is willing to accept the amendment.

My colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is interested, as are both Senators from Missouri. This amendment would not add any funds to the bill as passed by the House. The House included these items. The amendment would restore those funds. I was not present at the markup of this part of the bill. I was present during the markup of the Public Works provisions of the measure, but when that part of the markup was concluded, I had to leave for another appointment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join my colleague in his statement. I received a call this morning from people who are extremely interested in this small item. As my colleague has said, it was contained in the House version. I hope very much that the Senate will adopt it. I believe that its omission was an oversight.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the distinguished Senators from Arkansas. This is a matter that is extremely vital to southeast Missouri. Some of the towns in southeastern Missouri have been among the earliest consumers of public power from the time it became available. The use of such power in that area has increased eight times. It is still rapidly increasing. The matter is of extreme importance to southeast Missouri, particularly to cities like Poplar Bluff, Kennett, and other cities in that area. I am grateful to the Senator for offering the amendment, and to the chairman of the committee for accepting it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few hours ago the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] came to see me about this particular matter. I stated to him that the item was included in title II, which was handled by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and that I would talk with the Senator from Arizona in support of this budgeted item. As was stated by the distinguished Senator from



Arkansas, the item was not only budgeted, but it was also in the House version. I am glad to note that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1202, and ask that its reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Proxmire is as follows:

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete "\$942,791,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$942,126,200".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would eliminate \$665,000 which is being asked to complete planning and to undertake construction on the Brookville Reservoir project. If ever undertaken, this project would ultimately cost the Federal Government \$27.2 million. In other words, this is merely a downpayment.

The project consists of a dam and reservoir to be built 2.4 miles north of Brookville, Ind., on the East Fork of the Whitewater River. Flood control and improved recreation and fish and wildlife facilities are the major benefits which will allegedly result from this project.

However, the actual benefits will simply not be great enough to justify this project.

The last serious flood in the area was in 1913. Since then dredging of the river has been completed and levies have been built. It is patently ridiculous to use the \$639,000 damage caused by the 1913 flood to justify a project today, when major provisions have already been made to prevent another such flood.

Those floods which have occurred since 1913 are largely attributable to the West Fork of the Whitewater River, rather than the East Fork where the proposed project is to be built. Actually, the East Fork drains only 383 square miles, or only one-fourth the total area of the Whitewater River Basin.

However, the most telling criticism of this project is that the land which would be destroyed by the reservoir and dam would be of as great a value and of equal size as the land which would be protected by the dam. The main stem of the steep-sloped river which would be protected by the dam is only 29 miles long, while the reservoir would be over 20 miles long and would cover 2,600 acres.

The local farmers themselves are upset over this situation. At a hearing held in Brookville, the soil and water conservation districts of the three counties in the area submitted independent statements which all expressed concern over the loss of valuable bottom land as a result of the project. The

value of the production on the land which will be lost has been estimated to be between \$350,000 and \$500,000 per year.

The plain fact is that adequate flood protection is undoubtedly possible through existing programs. The Whitewater Valley Watershed Association has been organized in the area to foster watershed projects as provided for under Public Law 566. An application was filed in June 1961 for a watershed project on the east fork of the river. This was recently amended to include all the area drained by the east fork. Planning parties are now being organized to carry through work on this watershed project. No attempt is being made to analyze the flood control benefits of the proposed dam with the watershed program taken into consideration. As a matter of fact, the soil and water conservation districts of the counties involved all said that that project should not be built until the watershed projects had been completed. And, Colonel Pinnel of the Corps of Army Engineers in Senate Appropriations Committee hearings said that the watershed project would definitely provide upstream flood protection.

Does it not seem likely that this going project will take care of the minimal flood problem in the east fork drainage area?

The Brookville project is further suspect because of the considerable amount of local opposition which has arisen to it. A petition protesting this project has been filed with the Corps of Army Engineers. They themselves say it is one of the best prepared objections to a plan they have ever received. This petition is signed by 2,100 people from Union and Franklin Counties. Petitioners in Union County found that 80 to 90 percent of those contacted willingly signed their names against the dam.

But this is not all which speaks against this dam. The recreation facilities which would constitute 40 percent of the alleged benefits are both frivolous and unnecessary. There is already an abundance of recreation areas within easy reach of Brookville.

There is a 200-acre lake within a State park which is right next to the proposed reservoir site. It is in the same county.

There is a 500-acre lake only 15 miles away.

There is a 177-acre reservoir just above Richmond, Ind., on the headwaters of the same river fork which would be involved in the project.

There is a 90-mile Ohio River pool formed by the Markland Dam just 50 miles from the new proposed reservoir.

Despite the number of lakes already in the area, by going ahead with the Brookville project, the corps would provide seven more access areas for fishing, boating, and swimming. In view of this situation, one is justified in asking whether the corps' claim that these facilities would be used is based on real need for these facilities, or the vague hopes of the corps.

Undoubtedly there would be some users, but how significant would this be in the light of the facilities already in

existence? Surely there is no crying need for recreational facilities here.

Without these recreational benefits figured in, 40 percent of the project's supposed benefits would fall away. The benefit-cost ratio has been maintained over the past 10 years through the boosting of recreation and wildlife benefits. The present official benefit-cost ratio, figured on a 100-year 3-percent basis is 1.5-1. However, the much more realistic benefit-cost ratio, figured on a 50-year, 4-percent basis is only 0.8-1. This ratio includes all the mythical flood and recreation benefits.

The only possible conclusion is that this project is wholly unjustified. I ask that the Members of the Senate eliminate these funds and thereby save the American taxpayer from a flagrant waste of money.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this project was authorized in 1938. I do not believe any State in the Union has suffered more from floods than has Indiana. For one reason or another, some years ago, that State had refused to accept Federal funds on any project. Therefore it was somewhat neglected. It is my belief that this project and many other projects in Indiana that I have looked into are good projects. The benefit-to-cost ratio on this project is 1.5 to 1.

There was some opposition to this project presented to the committee. The opponents urged the construction of a series of small dams in the headwaters of the river. The Corps of Army Engineers after considering that plan decided that this would not be suitable, that it would be costly and would not do the job.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement from the Corps of Engineers on the opposition expressed by several witnesses, which appears on page 2231 and ending at page 2232 of the hearing.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BROOKVILLE RESERVOIR, IND.

Senator ELLENDER. The budget estimate is \$165,000 for planning, and local interests have requested a total of \$700,000 which would include completion of planning and initiation of construction. What is your capability on this project?

General GRAHAM. \$700,000, sir.

#### OPPOSITION

Senator ELLENDER. The committee has received a statement in opposition to this project. The opposition contends that watershed projects of the Department of Agriculture would represent a practical compromise solution to the water control problems in the Whitewater Valley. Would you comment on the practicality of the Soil Conservation Service program?

Colonel PINNELL. Mr. Chairman, we have studied the alternative proposal of this group of citizens who are opposed to the Brookville Reservoir project. In particular, they advocate construction of a group of small reservoirs farther upstream in the basin in lieu of the Brookville project. We have studied this problem and have found that such a small-reservoir plan would not be an effective or economical substitute for the Brookville project, but could complement



that project by providing for upstream flood protection.

Senator ELLENDER. With respect to the recreational benefits of this project, the opposition contends that there are many existing recreational facilities in the area that are not being adequately utilized at the present time; and that for water-based recreation the Ohio River is within 35 miles of the proposed damsite. Would you comment on the recreational aspects of this project?

#### RECREATION FACILITIES

Colonel PINNELL. Yes, sir. Our plans contemplate development of recreation facilities at seven access sites in the reservoir. The benefits to be derived from these facilities are calculated over the project life. We intend to provide boat-launching ramps, parking areas, picnic areas, and campsites in addition to roads, sanitary facilities, shelter houses, drinking water facilities, et cetera. We have no doubt that over the project life all of these facilities will be fully utilized and will justify their inclusion in the project. We estimate that the annual attendance at this project in use of the recreational facilities will be about 600,000 persons.

Senator ELLENDER. Again, with respect to flood control, the opposition contends that during the recent flooding throughout southern Indiana there was no serious flooding attributed to the East Fork, and they contend that this is due to the regulating effects of the Richmond Waterworks lake and the Whitewater State Park lake. Would you comment on the flood-producing potential of the East Fork?

Colonel PINNELL. Mr. Chairman, the flood potential of the East Fork is evidenced by the occurrence of at least 10 major floods since 1929. Eight of these floods exceeded the flood stage at Brookville, Ind., from 6.8 feet to 9.8 feet. The maximum flood of record in 1913 reached 23 feet above flood stage. In view of the major effect which Brookville Reservoir would have on the reduction of flood stages at Brookville and at the downstream points, we are fully convinced of the need for the project. The lakes cited by the opposition could not be relied upon to be effective in reducing flood crests. These lakes have no provision for flood control storage and although at times such storage may be available through a lowering of the lake levels for other reasons, it would just be a coincidence if the storage were available at the time of a flood.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this year's public works appropriation bill has special significance for Arkansas for it contains funds to keep the Arkansas River development program on schedule. In the interest of economy this project was budgeted substantially below the Engineers' capacity in the administration's budget, and the prospects of this development program falling behind schedule has been a source of concern to the local interests cooperating in the development of the river and to the Arkansas congressional delegation. When completed the Arkansas River navigation project will provide a primary transportation artery from the Mississippi River through the center of Arkansas and into Oklahoma. The flood control and power generation provided by the river program will make the Arkansas River Valley a prime industrial area. Substantial delay in its completion would result in greater expense to the

Federal Government because of increased cost of construction and land acquisition. Postponement of its completion would also mean the loss of its economic and recreational benefits for a substantial period of time.

Many communities along the river are working diligently to avail themselves of the river's potential through the development of port facilities. The people of Little Rock, Ark., recently voted a bond issue to finance a port in that community and Pine Bluff, Fort Smith and other cities have similar projects in the planning stage. These efforts must, however, be coordinated with an orderly program of development on the Arkansas. If the dams, locks, bank stabilization and other work on the river are not constructed on schedule these local development projects will be made more difficult and costly.

Thus, the deep cuts in the scheduled funding of this project contained in the budget caused grave concern throughout the Arkansas River Valley. The Arkansas and Oklahoma delegations repeatedly made the case for the project and urged that it be kept on schedule. However, in the interests of economy we ask only that the Arkansas receive its fair share.

The public works appropriation bill passed by the House contained \$47 million for navigation locks and dams on the Arkansas, an increase of \$5 million over the President's budget. I am pleased that the Senate bill provides \$51,500,000 for this item, virtually the full amount which can be effectively used by the Corps of Engineers in fiscal 1965. These funds along with the other appropriation for the dams, locks, and bank stabilization will keep the program on schedule. It has required a diligent effort on the part of the Arkansas and Oklahoma congressional delegations, and particularly my colleague, Senator McCLELLAN, to establish the need for this work and to make the case for maximum appropriation for it.

Last week we met with the President to seek his help. He thanked us for our willingness to help hold down the budget in the interests of economy, and knowing of our very vital interest in this work and the implications which it has for the economy of the Arkansas River Valley, he agreed that the improving Federal revenue picture permitted a supplemental budget request containing additional funds for the Arkansas. On the basis of this request, funds are included in the pending bill which will keep the development of the Arkansas on schedule and make possible its completion by the 1970 target date. I wish to express my thanks to the administration and to the Appropriations Committee for getting the whole Arkansas River program over a major hurdle. Also all those interested in this project owe thanks to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who as chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee has always been extremely helpful in the development of Arkansas water resources.

The money spent on the Arkansas and the development of the other waterways

of my State is an investment in our future—an investment which will be returned many times over to the Federal Government through the creation of a strong, balanced economy in my State. The funds contained in this bill will keep these efforts moving ahead on an even, economically sound schedule.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield time to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 4 minutes to the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, someone has supplied the Senator from Wisconsin with incorrect information, and this is probably indicative of the reason for his position. I would hope, in view of the facts that I shall state, that he would retract some of the statements he has made.

The last great flood in that area was in 1959. Pictures of it are in the booklet before me. The pictures vividly show, if the Senator from Wisconsin would care to look at them, the east fork of the river, looking downstream.

Another picture is a scene of Brookville, with people standing in the streets. Brookville was declared a disaster area, and the Governor asked the county commissioners to help alleviate the flood.

The previous worst flood was in 1937; 1959 was the last big flood. There was also a flood in March of this year. At that time President Johnson himself flew over the flooded area and observed that section of Indiana.

In 1937, \$287,000 worth of damage was done in Brookville alone. At that time President Roosevelt went to Indiana and viewed the disaster area.

In 1929, the amount of the flood loss was \$1 million.

In 1913 there was flood loss of \$4,500,000.

I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin must have overlooked these figures.

He spoke also of the Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service representatives have examined this area in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers. They have stated categorically that they cannot find other suitable areas in which to impound the water so as to prevent floods. They say they agree with the Army Engineers that this is the only site available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Col. R. J. B. Page, colonel of the Corps of Engineers and Acting Director of Civil Works, dated December 12, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Further reference is made to your letter inclosing one from Mr. Orval Sintz, of Brookville, Ind., requesting information regarding the Brookville Reservoir, Ind., project.

In reply to Mr. Sintz's questions, the Corps of Engineers' studies in the Whitewater River Basin were started in 1960. Field reconnaissance and map studies of the entire basin were made during the following year to determine the best potential project sites. This investigation was coordinated with that



of the Soil Conservation Service which was studying the East Fork of the Whitewater River under the authority of Public Law 566.

Due to the nature of the topography in the headwater areas, the Corps' investigations found upstream reservoir sites to be limited in number and of small capacity. Studies by the Soil Conservation Service resulted in similar findings. Our district engineer at Louisville was informally advised by that agency in April 1963 and again in December 1963 that their recommendation for the East Fork of the Whitewater River probably would not include reservoirs and that there appeared to be no possibility for upstream water storage equivalent to the capacity of the Brookville Reservoir project.

Inasmuch as our own studies and those of the Soil Conservation Service found only a limited potential for small watershed impoundments above Brookville which would provide effective flood protection, there was no basis for the Corps' preparation of specific cost estimates of such developments for comparison with the Brookville Reservoir.

Extension experience of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies engaged in the investigation, design, and construction of water resource developments clearly shows that the cost of a number of small reservoirs to provide storage equivalent to that of a single large reservoir is generally much greater than the cost of the single large reservoir. Also by reason of the smaller total drainage area controlled, the total benefits of the system of small reservoirs normally are less than for the large downstream reservoir. For these reasons, even if small watershed impoundments upstream from Brookville are found feasible and justified for protection of local agricultural areas, they would not constitute an effective or economical substitute for the downstream flood protection afforded by the Brookville Reservoir.

The Brookville project will reduce flood stages at agricultural lands below the dam and at the towns of Brookville, Cedar Grove, and West Harrison in Indiana and Harrison, Ohio. In addition, the Brookville Reservoir project will function as a unit of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin and will contribute to a reduction of flood damages along the Ohio River below the Miami River. The project also will provide substantial recreational and fish and wildlife benefits. The ratio of average annual benefits from the Brookville project compared to the average annual costs, including annual maintenance and amortization of the Federal investment, is 1.6 to 1.

I hope the above information will serve your present needs. Mr. Sintz's letter is returned.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. B. PAGE,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,  
Acting Director of Civil Works.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have received letters from many persons who support this reservoir project. In addition, I have received a petition containing more than 5,000 signatures.

Telegrams are coming into my office, and now number more than 200. These people want something done to control floods in the Brookville area.

What will be the ultimate cost of the project? There is no question that when a project is started, the cost will go up.

The bill contains more than \$38 million worth of commitments for the State of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I feel that in good conscience he should be making a start to reduce those projects before he attacks ours.

We people from Indiana feel that we have been neglected for too long. A

distasteful statute has been on the books. We have now remedied that situation. We received only \$1 million in construction money until 1959, the year I came to the Senate. We have tried to remedy flood conditions in Indiana, and the people of Indiana are with us.

We will stay in Indiana. We will not interfere with the business of Wisconsin. If the Senator from Wisconsin will let us alone, we shall be happy.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield time to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to second the plea that has been made by my senior colleague from Indiana and also by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Both my colleague and I cannot find words that will adequately express our deep appreciation for the effort the senior Senator from Louisiana has made on behalf of the people of Indiana in the important area of flood control.

Statements have been made about derogatory resolutions passed against Federal aid by the Indiana General Assembly. I know something about that firsthand, having been a member of the legislature. I helped to lead the forces that repelled this attack and helped to modernize Indiana's thinking, so far as the need to curb the flooding of our streams is concerned.

I have attended meetings at which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee testified that those who once opposed such a Federal flood control program are now leading a grassroots movement throughout Indiana to make certain that something is done to remedy the situation.

In the March 1964 flood, the Ohio River Valley Basin suffered flood damage to the extent of \$106 million.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that \$290 million damage was prevented in the Ohio River Basin by existing projects. Twenty-six million dollars damage might have been done in Indiana alone had it not been for the projects which the Senator from Louisiana was instrumental in making certain were constructed.

Therefore, I must find objection to the philosophy of the Senator from Wisconsin so far as the importance of flood control is concerned.

My senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has well pointed out that flood damages of \$4,500,000 have occurred in 1 year alone in the Brookville area.

The Senator from Wisconsin has referred to Public Law 566 type projects. It is technically impossible to curb this stream by small watershed projects because of its steep banks. However, I agree that we should place more emphasis on Public Law 566 projects.

When I placed the importance of this additional \$500,000 this year before the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, he included it in the committee report.

The people of Indiana have changed their thinking concerning flood control and have adopted a systematic approach

by starting one new reservoir each year rather than trying to start them all at once. Unless construction can be started this year on the Brookville Reservoir, there will be a whole year's delay in the total program, which we hope will eventually eliminate the flood control problem.

The amount of money the Federal Government spends on various and sundry projects is huge. With the exception, perhaps, of the field of education, I know of no other area in which we can get more return for the money expended than the area of flood control and water resources. All of us have had a chance to stand by our streams during floods and to see houses washed away and realize that people have lost their lives because we did not have the foresight to plan ahead.

I urge support of the Senator from Louisiana and his subcommittee by defeating the amendment. The amendment is an effort to be penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I understand I have 4 minutes remaining.

The fact is, and it has not been challenged, that so far as flood control is concerned, most of the damage that has been done comes from the west fork. What this proposal would do would be to provide protection for the east, not the west fork, so it would provide little flood control protection.

Furthermore, when I said that Colonel Pinnel, of the Corps of Army Engineers, said before the Senate Committee on Appropriations that the watershed project would provide west fork protection, I was not quoting correspondence or conversation. I was quoting his official statement in the hearings; what he said on the record; what he said when he made his statement before the committee. He said that watershed projects, of the Public Law 566 type, would provide flood control protection.

Even if we gave all the benefit of the doubt to the case made so eloquently by the Senators from Indiana, even if we assume all the benefits will be realized in full, and assume costs will not increase, though they always do, if we recognize the realities of life, that this should be a 50-year project, not a 100-year project; if we recognize that the cost to the Federal Treasury will in fact be at least 4 percent, not 2 and a fraction percent. If we recognized just those realistic and certain facts, we would see the benefits would be less than the cost by a 0.8 to 1 percent ratio.

I recognize that the distinguished Senators from Indiana feel strongly about this matter. I know they have had protestations from their State, but we should also take into deep consideration the fact that farmers would have their farms flooded and—although of course they would get compensation later—they still would lose their farms, on which they have lived for generations.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield back the remainder of his time, I also will yield back the remainder of my time.



Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1203 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment, No. 1203, submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE, is as follows:

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, delete "\$942,-791,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$942,-561,200".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that there is 20 minutes to a side on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ANOTHER WASTEFUL PUBLIC WORKS—MELVERN RESERVOIR, KANS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my next amendment is to eliminate from the bill some \$230,000 as an additional planning amount for the Melvern Reservoir project in Kansas with an estimated eventual cost of \$24.4 million.

This proposed dam is planned for the Osage River in Kansas. Preliminary plans call for an earthfill dam with an uncontrolled chute-type spillway.

Mr. President, there are many reasons for opposing this project. The first of these is that even under the Corps of Engineers own figures, it seems highly doubtful that this project will pay for itself. The benefit-cost ratio estimated by the corps is only 1.3 to 1. This is on the assumption of a 100 year life. Yet the corps itself, in earlier statements, apparently views this type of dam as having about a 50 year life. This change alone would probably make the project unprofitable. If, in addition, a more realistic assumption of a 4 percent interest rate is used, the ratio becomes 1.1 to 1. Finally, we all know that early estimates of the cost of a project such as this are notoriously understated. We can reasonably expect that the cost factors will rise as this project progresses.

Evidence of these increased costs are already available. One economic study, conducted by a professor of agricultural economics at Kansas State College, concluded that the annual agricultural loss in the Melvern Reservoir area would be some 20 times greater than the annual benefits as estimated by the Corps of Engineers. Just think of that. If this estimate is even near correct, and even

granting all of the benefits assumed by the corps, the benefit-cost ratio would be .05 to 1.

There is even more, Mr. President. Individual farmers with lands below the dam—who presumably are the beneficiaries of this project—are opposed to the project. The reason for this opposition is that with the dam and the continued flow of water from it, drainage of lands after floods would be slowed. This means a longer time before farmers can return to their fields and the greater possibility of loss of crops due to flooding.

Mr. President, there is no town of significant size, and no industrial center, below the proposed dam. Thus, the benefits attributed to the project, as far as protection from flooding are probably substantially exaggerated. This conclusion is supported by the fact that over 4,000 signatures have been obtained in opposition to this project, and nothing comparable has been obtained in support of the proposal.

It is also interesting to note that earlier corps studies have suggested that no damsites are practical in the area. At the same time, various alternatives, which are much less expensive, such as flow ways and levees, could be used. Much work along these lines, including dikes, channels, watersheds, and detention dams have already been initiated in the area.

The landowners in the area believe that far more effective protection from flooding can be obtained by watershed methods, which are, of course, much less costly and do not destroy highly productive river bottom land. This land is essential to the farmers in the area for feed crops to feed livestock during the winter months. Such a watershed would not only provide more flood control than a dam, but would also furnish more farm water supply, more subsoil water, cleaner city water, and improved soil.

Mr. President, the amount in this bill is small, and it is just for planning. However, a substantial amount is ultimately involved, these present funds can involve a commitment for the further expenditures, and sufficient planning has already been done to indicate grave doubts that the project should proceed. For all these reasons, I would hope my amendment is adopted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I recall, quite a few projects in Kansas were authorized, in flood control acts of 1936 and 1938, but up to the time I became chairman of the subcommittee, few were constructed, for the reason that many people living in the reservoir areas objected to the projects because they did not wish to lose their farms.

I can well remember the Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas. There was a great deal of opposition to its construction by many people who lived above the damsite.

However, today I am glad to say that Tuttle Creek has been completed and is a resounding success. The people who opposed the dam in the beginning are now for it. They see the benefits that came to the whole area as a result of its construction and use.

The same thing may be said about the Pomona Dam which was opposed by the same group opposing the Melvern Dam, and—by the way, I have received an invitation to attend its dedication in a few weeks—and here again there was a great deal of opposition to it by the people living above the damsite. But it seems that the construction of the dam—as was the case in Tuttle Creek—has brought about a change of heart on the part of those who previously opposed it.

Melvorn Dam was authorized in 1954. As the Senator from Wisconsin states, its benefit-cost ratio is 1.3 to 1. I believe that it is an important project, and needed for the control of floods in the area. We have already spent \$470,000 for the preparation of the detailed plans for it, and the amount that is now sought will complete all preconstruction planning on the project.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not true, however, that that benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.3 to 1 is without benefit of computing the additional water storage, and also the fish and wildlife benefits?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct; it does not include the fish and wildlife benefits.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Corps of Engineers testified, did it not, that when those two other additional elements are brought into the picture, the benefit-to-cost ratio will improve?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. I was speaking solely of the flood control benefits.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this reservoir is one of a chain of reservoirs which are known as the reservoirs on the Marais des Cygnes River in Osage County, Kans.

It has been stated by the Corps of Engineers, in a study of the water resources development program for Kansas, of which we have an agency headed by the Governor of Kansas, that they have made a study and reported to the Governor who has made a recommendation and report to the Corps of Engineers.

As the distinguished chairman said, the project was authorized in 1954. This item has budget approval. It has passed the House of Representatives. It is before the Senate now for final action.



The Corps of Engineers, in a study of the water resources development program for Kansas, the U.S. Army Engineers, Dallas, Tex., January 1963, had this to say:

This project will provide complete protection to an area of 6,100 acres on the upper Marais des Cygnes River, and will contribute to the protection of 86,000 acres downstream in Kansas and additional areas along the Osage River. The severity of the drought from June 1952 to April 1957, inclusive, clearly indicates the need for conservation storage. Preliminary estimates made by the U.S. Public Health Service indicate that a minimum flow of 30 second-feet should be maintained in the Marais des Cygnes River at Ottawa, to improve the quality of the water below the dam. Records of the flow of the river at Ottawa show that the discharge was less than 30 second-feet 84 percent of the time during the 5-year period mentioned above. This project, with adequate conservation storage, together with the authorized Pomona Reservoir, could have sustained the minimum desirable flow of 30 second-feet all of the time through this period.

These projects—and this project—are but part of another project for the control of water runoffs in our State for the beneficial use of water, which includes flood control, recreation, municipal water use, and other variable items which are of great benefit to our State.

I sincerely hope that the Senator's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that my colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is unavoidably absent, I ask unanimous consent that a statement he has prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the senior Senator from Wisconsin to delete from the public works appropriation bill \$230,000 to continue planning for the Melvern Reservoir on the Marais des Cygnes River in Osage County, Kans.

I take this position for three sound reasons. First, Melvern Reservoir is one of nine multipurpose reservoirs in this basin—five of which are in Kansas—which are designed to provide flood protection for the Kansas-Missouri area. The Pomona Reservoir on 110-Mile Creek was given top priority and will be completed this year. Melvern Reservoir is the second priority and planning on that project began in earnest last year with a \$250,000 appropriation. The third priority reservoir is Fort Scott, and this bill includes funds for initial planning on that project.

In addition, local flood control projects keyed to this overall program are proceeding in a similarly orderly fashion. Work has been completed on a \$4½ million local flood control project at Ottawa, Kans., and the city of Osawatomie is prepared to initiate its local protection project.

To delete this appropriation at this point would not only stop planning, which is already well along on this one project, but it would also destroy a critically integrated schedule for the whole basin.

Second. To delete this appropriation would represent a substantial waste of Federal funds as well as jeopardize substantial local investments. The Pomona Reservoir will be completed at a cost of approximately \$14 million. The Ottawa local protection has been completed at a cost of \$4½ million. Four hundred and seventy thousand dollars has already been put into planning on the

Melvorn project, \$250,000 in fiscal year 1964. Full return on the investment at Pomona and Ottawa cannot be achieved unless the balance of the program is carried out.

Third. The State of Kansas has developed a national reputation for responsible water resource development through its very well qualified and highly respected water resources board which evaluates each of these projects with great care. It has not succumbed to the glamour of a reservoir for a reservoir's sake. It does not approach these projects to "get Federal money into Kansas." Each project is carefully analyzed and is supported only as it relates to the maximum utilization of our valuable water resources and protection of local areas from flood damage. As evidence of this, within the last 2 years the water resources board has twice recommended against Federal authorization of reservoirs proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

With respect to Melvern Reservoir, this project has been approved by the water resources board, and the Governor specifically stated his approval of this appropriation, as have both Senators and the Member of Congress from that district, to the respective committees of Congress this year.

There is no logical justification for support of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is clear that those who are beneficiaries of the project, those for whom the project is built, even these do not like them. I have had petitions which have strongly opposed this project from the beneficiaries. People who benefit from them do not like them. Why in the world then should we spend hard-earned taxpayer money for people who do not want it spent?

As I said, an outstanding professor from Kansas State College has stated on the basis of very careful study that the agricultural loss would be 20 times greater than the flood-control benefits.

This is the last of my three amendments. I understand the prospect of success when one is bucking the old pork barrel. And make no mistake about it. This bill is the pork barrel. The distinguished Senator from Indiana stated that I should stop poking my nose into Indiana's business. Now, how about that, Mr. President? Is this only Indiana's business? This is money that comes from all the taxpayers of the country, Wisconsin as well as Indiana, and New York as well as Kansas. This is the tax money of all 50 States, not just Indiana's tax money. And, Mr. President, here is the tragic weakness of this pork barrel. Senators press for projects in their home State as is their right. And they win these projects as their right, even when the justification is as pitiful as in the three incredible examples which my amendments cite.

It seems to me that I have a duty, inasmuch as I think the projects are not justified, to protest them. I shall continue to protest them. It may take a long time to win on this issue. It will take time to win public understanding of this give-away. I may not have that much time in the Senate. But I intend to stand up and say so when I think the money is being extravagantly wasted. Not only that, I shall give the Senate an opportunity, as these amendments do, to reverse its position.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Was the Senator from Wisconsin in the vicinity of Brooksville at the time it was flooded?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin was not in the vicinity of Brooksville at the time it was flooded.

Mr. HARTKE. I was.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Indiana adopt the remarkable attitude that in order to oppose an unjustified and wasteful flood control project, a Senator must be at the flood site? The Senator from Wisconsin would tell the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] that there are far less costly methods of meeting this flood control problem. According to the testimony taken before the public committee in formal public hearings, Colonel Pinnell of the Corps of Engineers testified that watershed methods are better, and they are certainly cheaper.

If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would like to yield back the remainder of his time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin objects to all these projects. I have no objection to that. But I am certain that if he would study the matter more carefully and not depend entirely on the views of some of the opponents in the locality of the dams, he might take a different view of some of these projects.

I hope that hereafter, when the occasion arises, he will make it a point to study not only the views of the opposition to these dams, but also the views of those who propose them, particularly on the State level.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has a very good point. It is appropriate and proper for an opponent of these projects to study carefully the benefits and the disadvantages of these projects. I have tried to do that. My staff and I have gone over the hearings very carefully. We have tried to weigh them. I am still convinced that at least the three projects my amendments would delete are not justified.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment on page 4, line 9, to strike the numeral and insert \$942,-891,200."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this amendment will add \$100,000 to begin planning for the proposed



Burnsville Reservoir, in the Little Kanawha River Basin, W. Va.

I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], ranking member of the Public Works Committee, and ex-officio member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member.

This project was first authorized by Congress in 1938 in the wake of several disastrous floods throughout the country.

Since that time, the Army Corps of Engineers has periodically reviewed the project. In January of this year, Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, Director of Civil Works for the Army Engineers, reported on the project as follows:

Our recent restudy of this project shows it to be economically justified based on the flood control, recreation area redevelopment, and other benefits that its construction would provide. As a result of this restudy, the Burnsville Reservoir project has now been reclassified from the deferred to the active category of civil works projects and it is now eligible to be considered for future appropriations for preconstruction planning.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1965 does not include funds for preconstruction planning of the Burnsville project, but you may be sure that consideration will be given to the possibility of including funds for the purpose in connection with the preparation of future budget requests of the corps.

Mr. President, as General Graham indicated, this project was still in the deferred category at the time the fiscal year 1965 budget was prepared. That explains the reason why no request was made at the Bureau of the Budget level.

The Burnsville Reservoir would be located on the main stem of the Little Kanawha River and is considered a major installation in the overall flood control plan for the Ohio River Basin. The total cost of the project, when completed, is estimated to be \$19 million, and it would take approximately 2 years to complete preconstruction planning and approximately 4 years thereafter to complete the construction. No local participation would be required, and the benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.3 to 1.

In making its resurvey, the Army Engineers found as follows:

Due to rugged topography prevalent in the headwaters of the Little Kanawha River, frequent minor floods and periodical major floods inundate considerable areas in the Kanawha Basin and contribute materially to Ohio River floods.

Mr. President, the Burnsville Reservoir project will reduce flood damage in the Little Kanawha Basin and also in the Ohio River Basin.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, I have seen many flood control plans. I can say that this reservoir will offer a high degree of protection to the towns of Burnsville and Glenville. The Army Engineers have estimated that the annual savings from flood damages would be \$254,000.

This is not to say that floods occur each year, but the engineers expect them periodically and have averaged the anticipated damage at \$254,000 a year.

Moreover, Mr. President, the terrain of the area is such that adequate warn-

ing periods do not precede the flash floods which not infrequently occur, visiting destruction upon the properties of people and, indeed, destroying human life itself. During the period of record, several floods have caused severe damages in the more developed areas, and engineering studies indicate that much greater floods of disastrous magnitude are possible.

The Burnsville Reservoir project is one of an authorized three-reservoir system for reduction of flood damages in the Little Kanawha River Basin, and it is imperative that preliminary planning on this initial reservoir get under way as quickly as possible. Parenthetically, I wish to state that the flood protection to be offered by the Burnsville Reservoir would enhance the possible use of the flood plain for the location and expansion of industry inasmuch as the valley has a considerable potential for industrial development.

There are secondary considerations of recreation, area redevelopment and water quality control from which great benefits will accrue.

However, its main purpose is still the protection of lives and property from damaging floods. When completed, the reservoir would have a storage capacity of 66,000 acre-feet which represents a runoff of 7.5 inches of storm drainage.

The people in the area of the Burnsville Reservoir are very desirous of getting the project started, and I have received many letters from interested individuals and civic groups urging that planning be initiated as soon as possible. In previous years I have actively supported the appropriation of moneys for a restudy of the three reservoirs by the Army Engineers, and I earnestly hope that we can move forward expeditiously with early planning. The \$100,000 which would be added by my amendment would initiate the planning work, and I trust that the very capable and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept this amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask the Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. ELLENDER] to give to this project in the future—and I know that he shall—the very painstaking and earnest consideration which he has provided in the past.

This is a project which is surrounded by urgency. It is needed. West Virginia has been designated as "a mother of rivers." And this is truly so. In the section of West Virginia under discussion, floodwaters develop and rush very quickly from small creeks. It is difficult to assess the volume of water which can come almost within minutes and sweep down from our mountainsides into the valleys, causing not only loss of property but also causing loss of life.

Naturally, Mr. President, I am disappointed that neither the House Appropriations Committee nor that of this body recommended inclusion of planning funds for Burnsville Reservoir on the

Little Kanawha River in Braxton County, W. Va.

The record of hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee includes the transcripts of discussions with both the Ohio River Division Engineer and the Director of Civil Works of the Office of the Chief of Engineers concerning the proposed Burnsville project.

I reiterate the sound justification and associate my views with those of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] concerning the importance of a Burnsville impoundment. In this connection, I cite the justification introduced into the record by Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, Director of Civil Works for the Army Corps of Engineers:

Frequent minor floods and periodical major floods inundate considerable areas in the Little Kanawha River Basin and contribute materially to the Ohio River floods. The flashy nature of the floods preclude adequate warning periods. Several floods during the period of record have caused severe damages in developed areas in the valley, and studies indicate the possibility of much greater floods of disastrous magnitude. The Burnsville Reservoir project is a unit of the authorized three-reservoir system for reduction of flood damages in the Little Kanawha Basin, and is also a unit of the comprehensive plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin.

The flood control protection to be afforded by the Burnsville Reservoir project should greatly enhance the use of the flood plain for industrial and small business development. Adequate labor markets, transportation facilities, and proximity to heavily populated areas and fuel supplies all tend to add to the Little Kanawha valley's potential for such development. The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.3 to 1.

Mr. President, now that the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service and other cooperative agencies, has evolved a workable and economically feasible program for the Burnsville section of the flood-prone Little Kanawha River Basin, it is a matter of regret that immediate planning funds cannot be provided to begin working toward the solution indicated.

Refer to the language of the Corps of Engineers justification of this project. It is replete with reasons why the Congress should finance the capabilities of the engineers to move into this necessary work. I repeat and reemphasize: Frequent minor floods and periodical major floods inundate the Burnsville area and downstream in neighboring Gilmer and other counties.

And, Mr. President, this flooding, the engineers emphasize, contributes materially to Ohio River floods.

In spite of these reasons we are delaying and taking undue chances in the face of this engineer warning: Studies indicate the possibility of much greater floods of disastrous magnitude.

It is well-known fact that I am an advocate of more upstream impoundments in the vast and important Ohio River Basin. We must visualize the necessity of holding back in the uplands vast stores of the runoff which make up the disastrous mainstem floods of the Ohio and numerous of its major and minor tributaries. It is equally important that these large impoundments be



constructed for water storage and low flow augmentation purposes.

We are not proceeding fast enough with these upstream efforts and because of this we are permitting the recurrence of millions upon millions of dollars worth of flood damage, and the endangerment of health and life of many of our citizens.

I am not going to devote the time required to develop the subject fully this afternoon, but I express the opinion that we would do much better in Congress to place more urgency and more emphasis on headwaters flood control works for the next few years and slow down on our investments in river navigation facilities.

If we are to set limits on expenditures annually for water resource projects, I urge that more investment be allowed for flood protection works in the upland headwaters and less for mainstream navigation.

But I am not one to disparage or discourage river navigation and improvement of its facilities. I believe we are strong enough and wealthy enough as a nation to provide adequately for navigation and flood control. These are areas in which we must not shortchange America, its communities, and its citizens.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to include at this point an expression of the genuine appreciation I extend to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The hearings held on the Burnsville Reservoir project are constructive and informative. Its validity is made clear.

It is my hope—and I am sure my able colleague from West Virginia joins me in the hope—that although we have not been able to program funding of the project this year, our offer of the amendment indicates the seriousness of the situation as we view it. If there is a disposition on the part of the committee and its very distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to delay the project, not because delay is desirable but only because there is no budgeted amount for the item at this time, it would be my expressed hope that next year we could move forward with the Burnsville project. I appreciate very much the courtesy of my colleague in yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know of any two Senators whom I would rather accommodate than the two Senators from West Virginia. I realize the condition that has prevailed in their State for some time. I had the privilege of visiting there on a number of occasions in the past 2 or 3 months.

It will be recalled that several years ago the Subcommittee on Public Works had quite a task in including in the bill funds for the Summersville Reservoir, which will cost \$44,500,000.

The Senate put the project into the bill on two or three occasions before we were able to get the House to join us. Senators will remember that.

Last year the Justice Reservoir was included. The cost of that project is \$64 million. We had quite a task in retaining the money for that reservoir as

against the House provision, but we have it in, and I am glad to say that construction of Summersville Reservoir is well underway, and planning on the Justice Reservoir should be completed in fiscal year 1966.

This year the committee followed my advice by including a new planning start for the Birch Reservoir. The cost is estimated to be only \$6.5 million, but that is one unbudgeted project we added. Then we added funds for two additional reservoirs. It is my judgment that West Virginia has received its fair share, I believe, of the money to be spent this year. I shall ask my friend from West Virginia not to insist on the amendment. If he does, I should like to point out that many other Senators have projects that they would like to have included. I admire both Senators from West Virginia for taking care of their constituency. Next year we shall try to make a case for the project, and probably we shall be able to include it.

I ask that the Senator from West Virginia not insist on his amendment, because if he does, I must ask the Senate to vote it down.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the fairness which has been displayed by him at all times, not only toward myself, but also my colleagues who have appeared before the subcommittee and expressed interest in various projects in the respective States. The Senator has been most fair in his consideration of my State. The amendment which I have offered is not offered in any sense as a complaint. It has been offered because my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have felt that the project is justified. We recognize the fact that the item was not budgeted. We also recognize the problems that are concomitant to any item which is not so budgeted.

I recognize the very laborious and time-consuming task which confronts the chairman of the subcommittee. I realize that he cannot please every Senator in his effort to secure projects for his State.

Again I thank the chairman for his consideration of the problems of West Virginia as my colleague and I have attempted to bring those problems to the subcommittee's attention.

If it is agreeable to my colleague, at this time I should like to withdraw the amendment, particularly in view of the kind assurance of our subcommittee chairman that the item will receive careful consideration next year and that it may then be included.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I would associate myself with my colleague [Mr. BYRD] in his request to withdraw the amendment, remembering the assurance given to us by the capable and always dependable chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia is withdrawn.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL—FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to discuss briefly with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a situation of considerable concern to Montana. As the Senator knows, several months ago, the State of Montana suffered the most disastrous flood in the history of the State. Total property damage in both the private and public sector amounted to at least \$62 million, and possibly will reach \$100 million.

Now that the major recovery program is underway there is a general consensus of opinion that if there had been a more adequate system of flood control projects both east and west of the Continental Divide in Montana, a great deal of the damage would have been averted or minimized.

Flood damage west of the divide was controlled to a degree by Hungry Horse Dam and the operation of Flathead Lake, but there are several other projects which, if constructed, would have contributed much in the way of flood control. There are a number of proposals on the Flathead and Clark Fork Rivers. Studies have been completed on several, others have not progressed this far for one reason or another. To my knowledge there is no up-to-date recommendation by the Corps of Army Engineers as to which plan or combination of projects would contribute the most in providing the necessary flood control and associated benefits.

On the eastern side of the Continental Divide few will argue against the thesis that much of the damage would have been eliminated had the Sun Butte project on the Sun River and the flood control project at Great Falls been constructed. Tiber and Canyon Ferry Dams contributed much in flood control on the Marias and Missouri Rivers. I realize that in this area as well as in the West there are problems of local interest and participation as well as differing opinions as to the best plan. However, the extent and seriousness of this recent flood is a grim reminder of Mother Nature's devastation and unpredictability. It is vital that the Federal Government cooperate with the people of Montana in devising a plan to prevent future devastation.

I had hoped that the Senate Committee on Appropriations would have agreed to Senator METCALF's and my request for funds to permit the Corps of Army Engineers to update its reports and plans for the Flathead and Clark Fork Rivers and to ask the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to come up with a cooperative plan for flood control in the Sun and Marias River Basins. I would like to take this opportunity to seek the subcommittee chairman's advice and counsel on this matter. I recognize that our formal request was submitted rather late and did not allow for sufficient subcommittee consideration. I would like to know if this matter might be considered in conjunction with the supplemental appropriation bill or



whether the committee might ask the appropriate agencies to prepare and support the necessary budget requests for next year so that they might be considered early in the new year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very sorry that these studies were not submitted to the committee prior to the conclusion of the hearings, as the Senator admits. The subcommittee has followed the rule of not considering any surveys or projects unless it has a justification for them.

In answer to the question, these studies could be considered if a supplemental bill is considered in this session; but I would advise my good friend to have the necessary preparations made so that the studies can be considered in the regular bill. I believe it might be best to do that. But, if there is insistence and if a good case can be made, I am sure it can be considered by the committee in a supplemental bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is always most courteous, most considerate, and most understanding.

On the basis of his advice and counsel, my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and I will look into this matter and see what, if anything, can be further developed, either along the lines of a possible request in a supplemental appropriation or perhaps having a more detailed survey which can be presented in connection with next year's appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the amendment is very simple. I ask merely to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

The amendment offered by Mr. NELSON is as follows:

On page 11, line 16, strike out "\$185,689,000 of which \$83,030,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$184,189,000 of which \$81,530,000".

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is interested in this matter and I believe would wish to be notified. I suggest the absence of a quorum for the purpose of giving him notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to have unanimous consent to have a quorum call without the time being charged, because the time is under control.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from California has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. President, the amendment I have set to the desk strikes out \$1.5 million which this bill includes to implement the Westlands construction contract, which is now before Congress under a 90-day review procedure. That project is de-

scribed on page 32 of the committee report, under the title "Central Valley Project—San Luis Unit," as follows:

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 for initiation of work on a distribution system for the Westlands Water District.

The cost of that distribution system, when completed, is estimated to be in the amount of \$157 million.

A proposed contract between the Federal Government, Department of the Interior, and the Westlands District has been under procedures established by law pending before the Congress for almost 90 days. The expiration date on that contract for the Congress to take negative action is next Monday.

This proposed contract came to my attention about 5 or 6 weeks ago. I was sufficiently concerned about it to request a hearing on the proposed Westlands contract for the distribution system. There was a hearing.

I do not have the committee appearances before me, so I trust that if I make a misstatement as to the opposition to the contract the Senator from California will remind me, so that the RECORD may be correct. My recollection tells me that this proposal is opposed by the AFL-CIO, National, by the AFL-CIO of California, by the Farmers Union, National, by the Farmers Union of California, by the National Grange, and by the California Grange, and that it is opposed by Father Vizzard, representing the National Catholic Rural Life Council, and a number of individuals, and perhaps some other organizations.

It is opposed by those groups in the main, and I raise the question because I fear that the proposed contract may result in a major breach in the 160-acre limitation provided for under the reclamation law. I say "may" result in a major breach. If it does, there will be an unconscionable subsidy to large landholders in the Westlands district.

This issue has been argued on the floor before by a number of distinguished Senators, including the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], whom I see present in the Chamber, and other Senators.

The reclamation law and reclamation problems are new to the Senator from Wisconsin. I have served on that committee for only a year and a half. There are a number of distinguished authorities on reclamation projects on that committee, including the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who is in the Chamber.

When one listens to the arguments of the advocates of this contract, including the spokesman for the Department of the Interior, they present a persuasive case that there is no need to worry about the violation of the 160-acre limitation under the reclamation law. Then one can listen to distinguished, informed, and intelligent opponents of the contract, who will make a persuasive case that it will violate the 160-acre limitation.

In the Westlands district there are 352,000 acres of land. Of those 352,000 acres of land, 100,000 acres are held by landowners who are within the 160-acre limitation, or, if a married couple is in-

volved, within the 320-acre limitation. This leaves 250,000 acres in the Westlands district which is held by excess landowners, some of whom, including the Southern Pacific Railroad, hold as much as 55,000 acres within the Westlands District.

The purpose of the project is twofold: first, to provide surface water for irrigation; second, to recharge the underground water supply.

This is important. The land today is being irrigated by pumping, and the water table has dropped to 400 feet. It is as low as 425 feet in some areas of the Westlands district.

One of the specific stated purposes of the contract on the project is to restore the water level in the Westlands Water District to 300 feet. Again I call this to the special attention of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], to be sure that I am stating this fact correctly. The board of directors managing the Westlands Water District is composed of all the landholders within the district, represented on an acreage valuation basis.

This means that the excess landholders control the policy of the Westlands district, even as to how much will be charged for surface water, per acre-foot, and how much ad valorem tax will be charged, if any, for the acreage which does not agree to come under the contract.

Let us suppose that 325,000 acres come under the contract and that 27,000 acres do not. The Department of the Interior informs me, if that occurs, the water table will be restored to about 300 feet in 10 years, which means that the pumping cost of that 27,000 acres, to take my hypothetical case, will be reduced to \$13 an acre-foot from a present cost of \$15.

According to a letter I have received from the Department of the Interior, the cost of the irrigation water will be \$14 an acre-foot.

Therefore, under the hypothetical case that I present, the 27,000 acres held in single ownership can wait during this 10-year period and gain a benefit of \$1 per acre-foot as a consequence of the investment made by the taxpayers in this reclamation project. In fairness to the Department of the Interior, they assert that this will not happen. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the letter that I received from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,  
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1964.  
Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Assistant Secretary Holum asked that we respond to your two additional questions regarding probable water costs under certain assumed conditions in the Westlands Water District, Central Valley project. Your questions are restated with our answers.

Question 1. If 327,000 acres are in compliance and if all water cost is assigned to the 327,000 acres, what is the cost per acre-foot?



Answer. As the 783,000 acre-feet of project water available to the district is insufficient to meet the water demands of 327,000 acres, we assume ground water will also be used to assure a full water supply. On this basis we estimate the total annual cost for water would be about \$14.5 million or about \$14 an acre-foot. This includes costs for project water service, distribution system construction, distribution system operation and maintenance, and for the pumping of about 235,000 acre-feet of ground water annually. An assumption that the eligible land will bear the total cost of the project water supply for the district is probably not realistic. Irrespective of the amount of eligible and ineligible land, we fully anticipate that costs will be spread to some extent to all the lands of the district by ad valorem assessment. As was stated in Mr. Holum's July 29, 1964, letter to you, a revenue program based on a combination of water tolls and ad valorem assessments is used by a number of the districts in the San Joaquin Valley of California and is expected to be used by the Westlands Water District in achieving its objective of a balanced use of surface and ground water supplies.

Question 2. What is the per acre-foot cost of pumping at present depths and what is the pumping cost from the 300-foot level?

Answer. The present average depth to ground water in the Westlands Water District is approximately 400 to 425 feet. At this depth the cost of pumping is about \$15 an acre-foot. With a 300-foot pumping lift the estimated cost of ground water would be about \$13 an acre-foot. The difference in costs between the two pumping levels is due essentially to a difference in power requirements as other pumping facility costs will be approximately the same in either case.

We hope the above data provides the information you seek.

Sincerely yours,

N. B. BENNETT,  
*Acting Commissioner.*

Mr. NELSON. I wish to read from the letter. They say this will not happen, stating that:

An assumption that the eligible land will bear the total cost of the project water supply for the district is probably not realistic.

I repeat that at this late stage in the game, with my hypothetical case, the Bureau of Reclamation is only able to say that the assumption that the eligible land will bear the total cost of the project water supply is probably unrealistic.

Let us assume for a moment that the probability occurs. In that case we have a taxpayer money built project in which surface water seepage causes a reduction in the pumping cost, and the use of surface water reduces the necessity for pumping, thereby raising the water level to 300 feet. In that case we have given a literally fantastic subsidy to a large landholder.

Again, the Department will argue that this will not happen because at that stage of the game the board of directors, which has the power to determine the cost of the water, will reduce the price of the irrigation per acre cost low enough to require the leveling of the ad valorem tax on all landholders sufficient to force in the 27,000 acres.

What I have cited is one of a half dozen hypothetical cases that one might present.

I raised the question with the Bureau. They insist that economically it is absolutely necessary for the excess landholders to break up their holdings and come

in, because it is not economically feasible to stay out. My question was, if that is the case, it would seem that we should give assurance that the \$157 million that we are to spend on the distribution system will not be a waste of taxpayer money, or end up subsidizing large landholders. We should insist, before the contract is signed, that the excess landholders be required to sign recordable contracts.

The answer I received to that was that we have never done it before. Well, how many projects have we had like this one, in which, if my memory serves me right, the subsidy on the distribution system in interest rates not required to be paid has been \$60 million out of a \$157 million project? I believe that was the figure of the subsidy, \$60 million. This is a tremendous amount. I believe the taxpayers should have the assurance that we will not be furnishing a subsidy to the excess land holders.

Suppose we put \$157 million into this distribution system, and the board of directors, being controlled by the excess land holders, representing 252,000 acres decide that they are not going to sign recordable contracts and retain control of the Westlands District, it would seem to me—unless I am mistaken, and in that case I will stand corrected, because, as Senators know, I do not pass as an authority in this field, or on the history or background of reclamation projects, because my exposure to it has been only in the last year and a half in the committee—but if that should happen, then what we would be confronted with in Congress is that the excess land holders who cannot be compelled to come in would say, "We do not want the taxpayers to pay for it. Sell us our water and we will pay enough to pay the project's cost."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. How much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. If that should happen, then the excess landholders certainly could come in, if I understand the situation—and I stand corrected if I do not—and say to Congress, "The taxpayer does not have to lose any money. We will pay the price of the acre-foot cost to meet the contract, but we will not break up our landholdings, and there is nothing that you can do to force us."

If this happens, this will end up as the most unconscionable subsidy ever given to any group of people in my knowledge in this area, and perhaps in any other area, in modern history, if not in all history.

Therefore I think we ought to have a good hard look at this matter and not make the appropriation. We should wait until next January or February, to make the decision as to whether or not that appropriation should be made. I believe the contract ought to be turned down, or the Secretary should be instructed that the contract need not be signed until enough of the excess land-

holders have signed recordable contracts and guaranteed the success of the project.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield time to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several years ago the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, opposed the real birth of this problem, which was involved in the San Luis project. I support the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] today.

An attempt is being made to have the Senate pass what amounts to the approval of a bad contract.

I refer to a document entitled the "Contract Between the United States and Westlands Water District Providing for the Construction of a Water Distribution and Drainage Collector System." The illegality of that instrument is the subject of the "Statement of Senator GAYLORD NELSON on the Westlands Water District Construction Contract and Water Service Contract of 1963." That statement was entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only day before yesterday with the result that the vast majority of this body has only a most cursory knowledge of the "Westlands contract" as it is known.

Our immediate concern is an effort to have the Senate vote in favor of a \$157 million appropriation to build a reclamation project within the service area of the Westlands district. First and foremost, therefore, we must determine the present status of the matter; who will benefit from the project and why efforts are being made at this time to obtain approval of funds to carry it out.

#### 1. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE PROJECT?

Seventy percent of the lands within the Westlands district are ineligible to receive project water. That ineligibility stems from the fact that the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and other large landholders owning large tracts of land, will be the primary beneficiaries of the project. In a word, they are ineligible to receive water because their ownerships violate the congressional policy of furthering family-sized farms. It is obviously the pressure from these rich and powerful organizations which has brought about the effort to approve of the contract and to obtain these funds, although only a fraction of the land is entitled to use project water. This attempt to obtain funds for this purpose must be resisted for there are involved far-reaching and dangerous precedents which will emerge from the contract if it is approved and funds made available to effectuate it.

#### 2. WITH 70 PERCENT OF THE PROJECT LANDS INELIGIBLE, WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THE PROJECT?

As revealed by Senator NELSON's statement and the other data in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Bureau of Reclamation readily admits that 70 percent of the project is not eligible to receive water. As a consequence there is immediately raised this question: Who will be the beneficiaries of the project?



Answer to that inquiry is very simple for the primary beneficiaries will be the vast land and water monopolies which control the Westlands district, the board of directors of which is composed of landowners who are ineligible to receive project water. The next question which flows from that circumstance is this: How can the Bureau of Reclamation justify an expenditure of \$157 million when 70 percent of the project lands are ineligible to receive water? Response to this inquiry is not difficult—it cannot be done. However, the Bureau of Reclamation proceeds on two fallacies in its justification:

First, "The unavoidable clause." Primary reason for the project is to recharge the gravely depleted ground water basin which underlies both the ineligible and eligible lands. With full knowledge that the waters applied to the eligible lands will recharge the ground water basin for the ineligible lands, the Bureau of Reclamation wrote into the contract what is known as the unavoidable clause. That device calculated to circumvent the law, simply states that if project water unavoidably becomes available for use on the ineligible lands through the use of pumps, then the reclamation laws against those lands receiving water are not violated.

I reject as plain sophistry that reasoning and ask the Senate to reject it. For the calculated circumvention of the law by the Bureau of Reclamation makes a travesty of the long standing policy of the Congress to fight the land monopolists and to sponsor the family-sized farm.

Second, economic pressures will force the monopolists to reduce their holdings to 160 acres in conformity with the reclamation law. Though the Bureau of Reclamation readily admits the violation of the excess land laws, it seeks to gloss over that violation by this explanation: Sure the law will be violated—we know that. But do not worry, some day—no one knows when—or how—economic pressures stemming from taxes will force compliance with the reclamation laws. That astounding approach falls for two reasons:

First, the reclamation laws provide that project water may be received only by those who comply with the law. There is not a word—an implication—in the law which would permit violation until economic pressures may bring about compliance; and

Second, the Westlands district is completely and entirely controlled by the land monopolists. Thus it is absurd to think that they will adopt procedures and practices which will cause them to sell their immensely valuable lands and comply with the reclamation laws.

Those two conclusions are buttressed—if they need buttressing—by this fact: Once the project water is available to the ineligible lands with the immense benefits stemming from it, commonsense dictates that the monopolists will more firmly hold on to, rather than dispose of, them.

I do not claim to have full or expert knowledge respecting this complex contract and all that relates to it. Neverthe-

less, I do know that I am opposed to this raid on the Treasury of the United States by the land and water monopolists who seek under the guise of the reclamation laws to receive vast benefits. Unjust enrichment of this nature should not be countenanced by the Congress. Accordingly, I request the Senate to reject the Westlands contract and to refuse to appropriate funds to accomplish its purposes,

This item should be eliminated this year, so that it may be reviewed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Jacob Clayman, of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, in vigorous opposition to the proposal, and a statement by the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, one of whose great leaders, is Father Vizzard. He deserves, in my judgment, the thanks of the American people for his dedicated service over the years in protecting the principle of the 160-acre limitation and in protecting the family farm.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] has already named the great farm organizations which are opposed to the project.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD telegrams from Berge Bulbulian, president of the Western Water & Power Users Council, and Bard McAllister, of Visalia, Calif.

There being no objection, the statements and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JACOB CLAYMAN, ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR, INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, DEALING WITH THE PROPOSAL OF THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR FOR A WATER SERVICE CONTRACT WITH THE WESTLANDS IRRIGATION DISTRICT, SAN LUIS PROJECT, CALIFORNIA, JULY 8, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jacob Clayman. I am administrative director of the Industrial Union Department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I appear on behalf of the Industrial Union Department, an organization of 59 affiliated international unions with a total membership of some 6 million workers.

I am here to express our firm opposition to the proposed contract between the Department of Interior and the Westlands Irrigation District in the Federal service area of the San Luis project in the Central Valley of California.

We are in complete accord with our parent organization, the AFL-CIO in the statement presented on its behalf here today by George Taylor.

It is not our intention to lengthen the record here by attempting a detailed history of the reclamation law. All of you are familiar with that history, with the intent of Congress, with the pressures brought to bear on the Congress and the executive branches before and since the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902. Much of that history has been or will be touched upon in revealing detail by other witnesses, particularly by that esteemed citizen and guardian of the 160-acre limitation, Prof. Paul Taylor.

The history of the Reclamation Act has been one of struggle between those who would use the powers and finances of the Federal Government for development in the public interest, with careful protection against the unnecessary enrichment of large landholders, and those who would by one means or another use that same power and money for the enrichment of a few.

Organized labor has always supported resource development, including reclamation and irrigation projects, but we have as consistently insisted that our support was premised on development in the public interest. In the case of reclamation, this means, above all else, the avoidance of giveaways to great landed interests and, instead, development to strengthen the family farm and inhibit increasing concentration in the ownership of land.

In his fifth annual message to Congress, December 5, 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt stated our position today quite clearly.

"The creation of small irrigated farms under the Reclamation Act is a powerful offset to the tendency of certain other laws to foster or permit monopoly of the land.

"The Reclamation Act derives much of its value from the fact that it tends to secure the greatest possible number of homes on the land and to create communities of freeholders. \* \* \* The law requires that no right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one landowner. This provision has excited active and powerful hostility, but the success of the law itself depends on the wise and firm enforcement of it. We cannot afford to substitute tenants for freeholders on the public domain."

The reclamation law as described by Theodore Roosevelt in 1905 has not been changed by Congress. The acreage limitation provision has been held to be constitutional by the Supreme Court. The acreage restriction provision has continued to excite active and powerful hostility, but the Congress has not yielded to that hostility by changing the law. But may we stress another sentence in that 1905 statement, that "the success of the law itself depends on the wise and firm enforcement of it."

In our view, the proposed water contract is neither wise nor firm enforcement of the reclamation law. It would confer upon a few large landholders immense subsidies and, in our opinion, would never be improved by subsequent contracts.

We are aware that Interior has too frequently pursued the construction and even operation of irrigation projects before securing contracts requiring the disposition of excess lands. We are also aware that even where such contracts have been secured, early or late, it is common practice to put no final date for consummation in those contracts so that violation of the acreage restriction continues year after year on the basis of one pretext or another. But we are opposed to these practices as violations of the spirit and letter of the Reclamation Act, and we are here to express our unyielding opposition to adding one more bad contract on all the others.

We are experts in neither irrigation nor geology, but we place our faith and trust in those long-time champions of the public interest and the documentation they give their case, that extending water service to the Westlands District would result in furnishing water to excess landholders.

We urge this subcommittee, in the exercise of its legitimate oversight function, to disapprove the Westlands contract, return this proposed contract to the Secretary of Interior at once, and halt any further appropriations for construction until the Secretary has secured contracts from all owners of land in excess of 160 acres in the Federal service area agreeing that they will dispose of such excess lands as a condition



for receiving water and stipulating a deadline for the disposal of such lands.

Moreover, we would like to urge you to conduct a general investigation of the Federal land laws, particularly in relation to reclamation. The reports we receive would indicate that this proposed contract is only the latest in a long series of acts which deserve to be revealed publicly and corrected by law or administrative action.

In view of the position we are taking here today, we would like to call to your attention a portion of a speech made at the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Conference, October 1, 1958, by Ken Holum, then chairman of the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference and presently Assistant Secretary of Interior.

In reviewing the attacks on resources development and conservation, Mr. Holum said:

"Theodore Roosevelt championed the small farmer and the place of the family farm in our society. Do we still regard him highly today? Is the 160-acre limitation on reclamation projects that Roosevelt championed safe and secure? \* \* \* Have we learned to admire bigness above economic freedom?"

We express this same concern today, and urge this subcommittee to exercise its powers and influence to take firm action on this immediate problem and then focus the glare of public attention on any other evidences of carelessness, malfeasance, or lack of wisdom in administering this great program.

#### STATEMENT FROM THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AGRICULTURAL LIFE AND LABOR

War has been declared on poverty. Effectively to wage that war entails an attack upon the elements that give rise to poverty. One great source of rural poverty stems from the concentration of land ownership in the hands of the few who employ low-income families and individuals in the conduct of their agricultural operations.

An agency of the United States which has a mandate from Congress to foster and maintain family-sized farms is the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. In the vast irrigation projects constructed by it with Federal funds in the Western States, the "excess land laws" limit the delivery of water to that amount required to irrigate no more than 160 acres in a single ownership (320 acres for husband and wife). The explicit intent of this provision of reclamation law is to prevent land and water monopoly and to assure that public funds fulfill public policy—that is, the promotion of family farms.

Far from enforcing either the spirit or express language of the excess land laws, the Bureau of Reclamation has favored and continues to favor large landowners, whether it is in the Imperial Valley of California or the Salt River project in Arizona. Symptomatic of the Bureau's policies is the recent giveaway of millions of dollars to large landowners in the Glenn-Colusa area who have for 20 years diverted and used reclamation project waters in the Sacramento River without paying for the waters. Nevertheless, and seemingly with no legal basis, only weeks ago the Bureau canceled all of this vast indebtedness owing to the United States and entered into a contract exceedingly favorable to the excess-land owners.

In keeping with the Bureau's willingness to circumvent the excess land laws to the advantage of the great corporate farmers is its water service contract with the Westlands Water District in the San Luis project area in California. That document was submitted to the Congress on May 1, 1964, in accordance with the law. Within 90 days from that date it will become operative unless Congress objects to it. Contained in the Westlands contract are provisions the result of which constitutes a clear circumvention of the excess land laws.

Seventy percent of the lands within the district are owned in tracts subject to the excess land law. The United States agrees to deliver water to the district for the purpose of (a) surface irrigation; (b) recharging the depleted ground-water basin, a portion of which underlies the district. Immense benefits under the contract ensue both to lands eligible to receive water under the reclamation laws and those which are ineligible under the excess land laws. To accomplish that end the contract provides that: "The district will not be deemed to have furnished such water to said (excess) lands within the meaning of this contract if such water reached the underground strata \* \* \* as an unavoidable result of furnishing project water by the district to nonexcess lands."

Nature of this calculated violation of the excess land laws is demonstrated by these facts: (a) The project waters which go into the underground basin are pumped for use on both the eligible lands and those which violate the laws in question; (b) it is a physical impossibility to prevent the project water from benefiting the excess-land holdings; (c) the holders of those lands, knowing they will receive the benefits of the project, pay assessments to the district for the amortization of the debt owing to the United States, the same as the owners of eligible lands; (d) the Bureau of Reclamation officials are well aware of these facts but in effect join in the subterfuge; (e) the above quoted "unavoidable" clause is thus merely a device utilized to circumvent the basic laws against serving lands in tracts exceeding 160 (320) acres, thus fostering and perpetuating the land and water monopolies in violation of the specific direction of the Congress.

Success in the war against rural poverty turns upon the ability to reverse the ever-increasing trend toward large corporate farms which exploit human and natural resources. As a consequence, the policies and practices of the Bureau of Reclamation reviewed above, in clear violation of the excess land laws, contribute to that trend and are squarely at variance with the policy expressed by the Johnson administration.

A concerted drive against congressional approval of the Westland water service contract has already been initiated. Opposition to that contract has been voiced by interested organizations and agencies. Nonetheless the contract has already been approved in great haste by the House Interior Committee. It is essential therefore that as many groups and individuals as possible write to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to other members of the committee. They should be advised of the disregard of the law by the Bureau of Reclamation and requested that the committee hold public hearings as soon as possible so that interested parties may present vigorous opposition to this clear violation of the excess land laws.

FRESNO CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent rejection of Westlands contract and appropriation. Interior Committee hearings indicated contract illegal.

BERGE BULBULIAN,  
President, Western Water and Power  
Users Council.

VISALIA, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Kill premature Westlands Water District appropriations. Financially irresponsible because contract has not yet been approved.

BARD McALLISTER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the issue is simple: Shall we let the land monopolists of California subvert, by way of subterfuge, this precious protection of the family farm, that has been our land policy for many years?

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the comments I make on this occasion, I make on behalf of my colleague from California [Mr. SALINGER], of the government of the State of California, of the Department of the Interior, of the Budget Bureau, of the administration of the late President Kennedy, and of the incumbent Johnson administration.

I believe in the acreage limitation law. Let the RECORD be clear on that point. The fact is that the situation in question does not involve a violation of acreage limitation law. That ought to be made abundantly clear.

Several years ago, Congress authorized the construction of the San Luis project, to be paid for 55 percent by the people of the State of California and the balance by the Government of the United States. That balance is repayable to the Federal Treasury by the people who will use the benefits of the San Luis project.

Acting in accordance with the law, the administration of the late President Kennedy entered into a water service contract with the Westlands Water District, and that was agreed to. It follows the same pattern that the Government of the United States has used as a basis for entering into such contracts ever since 1926. Let the RECORD be very clear about that.

Now the administration recommends a distribution system be constructed, under a repayment contract, to deliver the water.

The Budget Bureau has recommended that this money be appropriated so that the construction of the distribution system be commenced.

Here is a district in California that will comply with the reclamation law. The best way to indicate that to my brothers in the Senate is to read a portion of the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum, before our Interior Committee recently when he urged that this contract be approved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT ON SERVICE OF THE WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT FROM THE SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

It is a pleasure to appear before this committee to review the Westlands Water District distribution system repayment contract. This contract, with the repayment obligation of \$157,048,000 is the largest repayment contract ever to be negotiated in the entire history of the reclamation program. It provides that the United States construct the distribution system and necessary drainage collector facilities to serve nearly 400,000 acres in the Federal San Luis unit service area of the Central Valley project, California.



Under the contract the District will repay these costs in 40 years. To better understand this contract and its relation to the Federal-State project now under construction, a brief review of certain congressional authorization and contractual agreements appears desirable.

By the act of June 3, 1960, the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the State of California for the construction and operation of the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley project. Pursuant to this authority the Secretary entered into an agreement on December 30, 1961, for Federal-State financing of the San Luis unit. This agreement was furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on January 9, 1962. This Federal-State agreement is unique in that it is the first ever negotiated under which the United States would undertake the financing and construction of a reclamation project as a joint venture with a State government. The construction cost of the joint-use facilities is expected to exceed \$400 million, 55 percent of which is scheduled to be advanced by the State. The State is now advancing on a monthly basis its share of the cost of the joint venture.

Initial water storage in the San Luis Dam is scheduled during the winter of 1967 and initial limited water deliveries are expected to follow in the summer of 1968. Larger water supplies are expected to be available in 1969.

The service area of the Federal San Luis unit of the Central Valley project includes a gross area of approximately 500,000 acres on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, and between Mendota on the north and Kettleman City on the south. The Federal share of water from the joint San Luis storage and conveyance facilities is estimated at 1,235,000 acre-feet annually for use in this highly productive but water deficient area. About 45,000 acre-feet is considered for municipal and industrial use; the balance of 1,190,000 acre-feet is considered for agricultural use.

The Westlands Water District is the principal contractor for Federal service from the San Luis unit. Except for certain small areas above the canal, the district lies between the trough of the valley on the east and the alignment of the San Luis Canal along the foothills of the coastal area on the west. The district is the largest in the area and includes 391,000 acres, about 352,000 acres of which are irrigable.

The district needs water to supplement the limited pumped ground water supplies available from ever-increasing depths. To meet this need the district requested supplemental water service from the Federal San Luis unit. A proposed water service contract was approved by President Kennedy on January 28, 1963, and the contract was executed June 5, 1963.

Under this contract 1,008,000 acre-feet of project water will be available annually during the first 10 years. It is hoped that during this 10-year period the use of large quantities of project water will temporarily abate much of the underground pumping and will allow natural recharge to stabilize ground water at about 100 feet above present levels. After 10 years the district is obligated to pay for 783,000 acre-feet annually, which, with the ground water calculated to be available, will be adequate to meet all irrigation requirements. If the ground water supply does not respond as anticipated, the district may purchase up to 117,000 acre-feet more, making a maximum, after 10 years, of 900,000 acre-feet annually.

No project water will be delivered through the distribution system to any lands or persons not eligible under the terms of articles 23, 24, and 25 to receive water made available pursuant to the contract. These arti-

cles, the so-called excess land provisions required by reclamation law, are similar in form and content to those in other water service contracts for Central Valley project.

The Westlands District will pay the United States \$7.50 an acre-foot for water service plus 50 cents an acre-foot for drainage service. Under full development conditions, annual project revenues from the sale of 783,000 acre-feet to the district would yield about \$6¼ million.

Under the service contract, water is delivered at canalside; therefore, before the district can effectively utilize project water, and before the United States will be in a position to receive revenues for project water service on a continuing basis, distribution and drainage collector facilities will have to be constructed. Such facilities may be financed and constructed by the district or by the United States. The Westlands Water District has asked for Federal construction.

The form of contract providing for the construction by the United States of the Westlands Water District distribution and drainage collector facilities, and for the repayment of these costs by the district in 40 years, has been approved by the directors of the Westlands Water District, by the Secretary of the Interior, and by the California Districts Securities Commission—the financial guardian of public water districts in that State.

The Secretary of the Interior approved the form of the proposed contract April 24, 1964. The same day he transmitted copies of the proposed contract to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. These transmittals were made in accordance with the requirements of section 8 of the San Luis unit authorizing act of June 3, 1950 (Public Law 86-488).

Section 8 of that act provides that funds will not be appropriated for construction of a distribution system and drains until 90 legislative days after a contract has been submitted to the Congress calling for complete repayment of the distribution system and drains within a period of 40 years from the date such works are placed in service. Copies of the distribution and drainage contract, hereafter referred to as a distribution system repayment contract, also were recently furnished to members of this Subcommittee.

Facilities to be constructed under the distribution system contract include a system of pipelines, the connection of ground water wells with those lines, and a drainage system.

The water distribution pipelines will have a total length of about 713 miles. Spacing of laterals will be at 1-mile intervals along section lines with turnouts to each 160 acres. The estimated cost of the distribution lines is \$106,363,000.

Approximately 400 existing wells in the area will be integrated into the distribution system. Well water will be mixed with surface project water in the main laterals. The estimated cost for integrating well water amounts to \$10,160,000.

The drainage collector system will be constructed of clay pipe terminating in buried reservoirs or sumps from which the water will be pumped into the States proposed master drain for the San Joaquin Valley or into a Federal interceptor drain for the San Luis unit. The area to be covered by this system lies predominately along the east side of the district near the trough of the valley. Estimated cost of the drainage collector facilities is \$40,525,000.

Facilities to be constructed under the contract will be separated into construction groups. Construction group 1 will include substantially all of the water distribution facilities, drainage collector facilities, and works for the integration of ground water with surface water, all as initially required and generally as exhibited in the contract.

Construction groups 2 and 3 will include added portions of the distribution system on which construction is started no later than June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1979, respectively. Any construction started after June 30, 1979, will be considered as part of construction group 3 for purposes of repayment.

The United States will acquire for the distribution system any pipeline facilities and sublaterals which are constructed by the district and are usable as an integral part of the system. The amount which the United States will pay for such facilities, including rights-of-way, is not to exceed the lesser of (a) the cost which the United States would have incurred if it had constructed such facilities or (b) the appropriate costs incurred by the district in constructing said facilities less the amount received from the United States in payment of water transported to the area for subsidence control during construction. It is planned that rights-of-way required for construction of the distribution system will be acquired by the district. Title may be taken directly in the name of the United States or taken by the district and then transferred to the United States. The United States will reimburse the district for the cost of the rights-of-way.

The construction cost of construction group 1 is to be repaid by the district in 80 successive semiannual installments payable on January 1 and July 1 of each year after the completion of construction of said group is announced in writing by the contracting officer. The first 10 payments will be for one-one hundred sixtieth of the construction cost of said group and the remaining 70 payments will be for equal amounts of the remainder of the cost. Construction costs of subsequent groups will be repaid in 80 successive equal semiannual installments payable on January 1 and July 1 of each year. The first installment with respect to each group will be due and payable on January 1 of the year following the year of completion of the respective group as announced by the contracting officer.

Under the contract the district as a whole is obligated to pay charges becoming due. To meet payments, the district is to use its resources and authority, including the levying and collecting of necessary taxes and assessments. The lands which may be charged with such taxes and assessments are described as all the lands in the district.

Upon completion of each construction group, it is to be transferred to the district for operation and maintenance. The district, without expense to the United States, is to operate and maintain such transferred works in full compliance with the terms of the contract and in such manner that said transferred works will remain in good and efficient condition.

No liability will accrue against the United States and its officers and employees because of damage arising out of or in any manner connected with the care, operation, and maintenance by the district of the distribution system.

The actual cost of the distribution system or any construction group thereof will embrace all expenditures by the United States of whatever kind in connection with, growing out of, or resulting from work performed in connection with the distribution system, and will include all sums expended by the Bureau of Reclamation in surveys and investigations in connection with the distribution system both prior to and after the execution of this contract and the expense of all soil investigations and other preliminary work.

The contract provides for a \$250,000 reserve fund to be accumulated by the district at the rate of \$50,000 annually. Expenditures from this fund will be for the purpose of meeting extraordinary cost of care, opera-



tion, maintenance repairs, and replacements. Whenever the reserve fund is reduced below \$250,000 it will be restored by annual deposits of \$50,000 annually.

In the event the United States transfers the San Luis Unit or portions thereof to the State of California for care, operation, and maintenance, such transfer will not affect the rights or obligations of either party to the contract.

Although the language in the contract is brief, I propose to discuss in some detail the excess land provisions. Over a year ago, on June 5, 1963, to be exact, the Westlands Water District and the United States entered into a water service contract whereunder the district is to receive a supply of Central Valley reclamation project water through the facilities of the San Luis unit of that project. Articles 23, 24, and 25 of that water service contract are similar to the acreage limitation provisions that have customarily been employed throughout the Central Valley project since the initial contracts were entered into more than 15 years ago. The acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law have been fully applicable since June 5, 1963, to all lands which make up the Westlands Water District. Looking then to article 20 of the distribution system one finds that, and I quote, "No water shall be delivered through the distribution system to any lands or person ineligible under the terms of articles 23, 24, and 25 of the water service contract to receive water made available pursuant to that contract." Even more significantly, under the distribution system contract, those provisions are expanded to include not only Central Valley project water, but additionally any other water regardless of source, to the extent that such water is conveyed through that distribution system.

Under the controlling contractual provisions, excess lands are categorically identified as "that part of the irrigable land within the district in excess of 160 acres held in the beneficial ownership of any single person; or in excess of 320 acres held in the beneficial ownership of husband and wife jointly, as tenants in common, or by the entirety, or as community property;". Landholdings falling within the 160 or 320 irrigable acre limit thus established are correspondingly defined as nonexcess land. Having thus contractually defined excess and nonexcess lands those same articles specifically prohibit the delivery of project water to any such excess lands unless and until the owner thereof shall have covered the excess lands in question by a valid recordable contract in form prescribed by the United States.

Additionally, it is contractually required under the water service contract that any large landowner, whether or not he enters into a recordable contract, designate that portion of his total irrigable landholding which is to be identified as his nonexcess lands. The remainder is thereafter identified as excess and as such is ineligible to receive project water unless and until it has been covered by a valid recordable contract.

Finally the articles establish the basic terms and conditions to which the large landowner agrees in executing the requisite recordable contract. The recordable contract first identifies the irrigable lands covered thereunder which are excess in the ownership of the person or persons executing the contracts. It additionally provides for the determination by the Secretary, as guided by an appraisal, of the actual bona fide value of such lands and the improvements thereon at date of appraisal. It stipulates, however, that in any such appraisal no value will be given such lands on account of the existing or prospective possibility of securing water from the project.

Finally the large landowner who executes a recordable contract agrees to dispose of

those excess lands within 10 years from the execution date of said contract, at prices not in excess of its value without project benefits, and to a person or persons who can take title to such as nonexcess lands. Should the large landowner fail to dispose of the land within that 10-year period, power of attorney then vests in the Secretary of the Interior to make the agreed upon disposition.

It is also important that proper attention be given the provision appearing in article 23(a) of the Westlands Water District water service contract. That provision reads in part, "No sale of any excess lands shall carry the right to receive water made available pursuant to this contract unless and until the purchase price involved in such sale is approved by the contracting officer." Thus, even though excess land is not covered by a recordable contract, and is sold in eligibly sized parcels, the sale must be at approved values in compliance with the antispeculation provisions of reclamation law, if such lands are to become eligible either to receive project water or service through the distribution system.

Some concern has also been expressed with respect to the pumping of ground water. The Westlands Water District water service contract includes as article 23(b) the standard Central Valley project contractual clause which reads:

"If project water furnished to the district pursuant to this contract reaches the underground strata of excess land owned by a large landowner, as defined in subdivision (a) of article 25 hereof, who has not executed a recordable contract and the large landowner pumps such project water from the underground, the district will not be deemed to have furnished such water to said lands within the meaning of this contract if such water reached the underground strata of the aforesaid excess land as an unavoidable result of the furnishing of project water by the district to nonexcess lands or to excess lands with respect to which a recordable contract has been executed."

It is recognized that unavoidable percolation increments, combined with the effects of decreased districtwide pumping occasioned by the availability of the project surface supply will contribute in some measure to the enhancement of the general ground water situation. It must be noted, however, that the water to which the quoted contractual subarticle refers is not water deliberately introduced in quantity into the underground through percolation beds or similar means for intensified storage and recharge purposes. No direct ground water percolation operations are planned in the Westlands area nor are facilities for such to be constructed. Thus, the water which might effectively be recovered by any landowner under the foregoing contractual clause would be only that which unavoidably percolates to the underground as the result of normal surface application of irrigation water for purposes of crop production, maintenance of salt balance, or similar bona fide irrigation practices conducted on eligible lands.

It must additionally be noted that present plans for the construction of the Westlands distribution system contemplate that approximately 400 wells existing in the area will be integrated into the distribution system. The yield from such wells will thus be mixed with project water within that distribution system. Referring again to article 20 of the distribution system contract it immediately becomes apparent that no water, whether it be project water delivered to the district distribution system from the San Luis Canal or ground water pumped into the distribution system from any of those 400 wells, may be delivered through the distribution system other than to land for which eligibility has been established pursuant to the provisions of reclamation law.

In consideration of the interrelated provisions contained in the distribution system contract and the equally pertinent and overriding water service contract, it is apparent that the lands of the Westlands Water District are in fact subject to the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law. To the best of our ability, all of those requirements have been properly iterated in those contracts. Correspondingly, the water district has through its execution of the water service contract and its acceptance of the distribution system contract recognized the applicability of such a provision and agreed to comply therewith.

With reference to excess lands, you know that the Department has at the specific request of your full committee just concluded a comprehensive review of the entire subject in both its administrative and legal connotations. Our final report as transmitted to the committee on June 30 recognized both the need for certain legislative actions to bring the acreage limitation provisions of law into a more practicably applicable form and made appropriate recommendations in that regard. Additionally, our report pointed to a number of issues that have emerged under the excess land laws that we believe warrant congressional review. I want to reiterate here our desire and willingness to cooperate with the Congress in its consideration of these matters.

Mr. KUCHEL. This is at the bottom of page 8 of the prepared statement:

Although the language in the contract is brief, I propose to discuss in some detail the excess land provisions. Over a year ago, on June 5, 1963, to be exact, the Westlands Water District and the United States entered into a water service contract whereunder the district is to receive a supply of Central Valley reclamation project water through the facilities of the San Luis unit of that project. Articles 23, 24, and 25 of that water service contract are similar to the acreage limitation provisions that have customarily been employed throughout the Central Valley project since the initial contracts were entered into more than 15 years ago.

I will say to Senators from other reclamation States that similar contracts have been used in their States with respect to supplemental water.

I continue with the statement:

The acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law have been fully applicable since June 5, 1963, to all lands which make up the Westlands water district. Looking then to article 20 of the distribution system contract one finds that, and I quote, "No water shall be delivered through the distribution system to any lands or person ineligible under the terms of articles 23, 24, and 25 of the water service contract to receive water made available pursuant to that contract."

In other words, they do not get water through this distribution system for excess land unless they comply with reclamation law and sign a recordable contract under which they agree to divest themselves of the land that they hold in excess of 160 acres in individual ownership within 10 years after water begins to be placed on the land.

Congress has passed the reclamation law. It provides that if an area is to be served by the Federal Government with supplemental water to be brought on the land to make things grow, we cannot have an unjust enrichment. If one wants water for more than 160 acres, he must agree to sell the excess within a period of time.



Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not yet.

Congress has never required, however, that the landholders in every block of property within that district sign such a contract. If we did, we would not have built most of the reclamation projects which have been of such great benefit. If we wish to ask Congress to make every single landowner, as a condition precedent, sign a contract, let a bill be introduced and brought to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and let the pros and cons on that particular argument be decided by committees, and then by Congress. But, do not single out one irrigation project in my State, and do not say that we are not going to approve the item for this project in California, although the contract complies with reclamation law, and the procedure is precisely the same which the Government has required every time it has entered into this kind of negotiation since 1926.

I have listened to the arguments, pro and con, of those who came before my Interior Committee with respect to this problem. I suggest that if they wish to change the basic law, they should come forward with a bill, and let us explore it. I do not believe I need to apologize to anyone for my record in the Senate with respect to reclamation.

The House Interior Committee has approved this contract, and there has been no adverse action in the Senate Interior Committee. I repeat that the administration recommends this contract. My State government has recommended it. We shall be carrying on what I believe will be an item which is completely in the public interest, and there will be no unjust enrichment; for no water will be delivered to any landowner unless he executes the contract which reclamation law requires.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am very glad to yield at this point to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Seventy percent of the land is in the hands of excess landholders. Am I correct in my remembrance, that the board of directors, which determines the policy of the Westlands district, is made up of all landholders in the Westlands district?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is made up of several who are elected.

Mr. NELSON. And that 100,000 acres is held by those within a limitation of 160- to 320-acre limit, leaving 252,000 acres, or about 70 percent, which is held by excess landholders; is that about correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not recall the exact percentages, but for the purposes of this argument, let us assume that the Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. My question is this: Since the board of directors will be controlled by excess landholders representing all but 100,000 of 352,000 acres, what is to require them to ever sign a recordable contract? Suppose the landholders on 252,000 acres controlling the board

say, "We decide not to sign"? What happens?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall try to answer the question, although I believe the Senator will recall, if he was present when the representatives for the district testified, that they spoke of the large landowners who desired and who said publicly that they wished to sign recordable contracts. I believe the Senator will remember that.

Mr. NELSON. I believe that some of them did.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. But not all of them.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct, too. The law does not require all of them to do so.

Mr. NELSON. I am asking the Senator this precise question: What happens if landholders on a majority of the acreage decline to join, and remain in control of the district? Is there any authority for the Federal Government to require them to comply?

Mr. KUCHEL. There is a contract. The Senator should remember that under California law the district places a tax or an assessment on the properties involved in order to pay its obligations. It has an obligation which runs directly to the Federal Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Government of the United States, in the event of default on the repayment required by either contract, would own an area that would be worth considerably more than the price of the contract.

Mr. NELSON. I say to the Senator that that is not correct. The board of directors can determine the irrigation cost per acre-foot, and then determine the ad valorem cost to meet the contract price, so they can meet the district contract obligation without any trouble and still never sign a recordable contract; is that not correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is incorrect.

Mr. NELSON. That is incorrect? Do they not have the power to levy the cost per acre-foot and to levy the ad valorem tax? and since they are the excess landholders, holding a majority, they would levy both costs—per acre-foot cost and ad valorem—at a price most favorable to them; would they not?

Mr. KUCHEL. The price at which the water is to be sold will apply to anyone who signs a recordable contract and who buys it. If an excess landowner does not desire to sign a recordable contract, he gets no water. He does not get the benefit of this project.

Mr. NELSON. I think that is incorrect. One objective of the project is to increase the water level from 425 feet to 300 feet which would save them \$2 an acre-foot in pumping cost. It would cost him \$13 an acre-foot in his pump-

ing costs. It now costs him \$15. Project water for irrigation will cost \$14 an acre-foot. Thus his pumping cost will be \$1 an acre-foot less than project water because the water level has been raised to 300 feet.

Mr. KUCHEL. In one instance in a reclamation project I do recall that a provision was made for recharge—percolation—of water to bring up the ground level. This is not the case in this project which is now before us. I again refer to the words of Secretary Holum, who was representing the Department of the Interior at the recent hearings before our Interior Committee. I read from the statement which I had printed in the RECORD:

No direct ground water percolation operations are planned in the Westlands area nor are facilities for such to be constructed.

Mr. NELSON. Did not Secretary Holum or his counsel specifically testify that one of the purposes of the project is to raise the water level from 400 to 300 feet, and that the way this would occur was to reduce the pumping? This would afford an opportunity for anyone who stayed out to reduce his costs by \$2 an acre-foot. It would cost \$13 an acre-foot when pumped from 300 feet which would result in a cost of \$1 an acre-foot less than buying it. Is that not correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. That is not correct.

Mr. NELSON. In what way is it in error?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator wants to try to document that in the RECORD let him go ahead and do it. All I know is that this project will furnish supplemental water to those landowners who sign recordable contracts to dispose of their excess land ten years after they receive the water. If an excess land owner does not sign a recordable contract, he will not receive supplemental water. That is the way the reclamation projects have come into existence from the beginning. And the disputed provision of the contract in this case is word for word and comma for comma the same as has been repeatedly used by the Federal Government. There is no difference. The Senator knows that to be a fact.

I regret that on this occasion the Senator takes a position in opposition. I remember when the San Luis legislation was before the Senate. I remember some Senators who opposed it. But the San Luis project was approved by Congress and was enacted into law.

It is an excellent public project, and the first of its kind in which the people of one State are underwriting more than half the cost. The senior Senator from Oregon will have to concede that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say most respectfully that what the Senator has been talking about is surface water and not underground water. What we have here is a program that is aimed at building up the water level. But when that water level is built up, the landowners can pump. They do not have to sell. They have their water level. They cannot get surface water. They can get underground water. We should include a



requirement that they must enter into the contract, and that if not included in the contract, they will be denied the privilege of pumping the underground water level. Two bodies of water are involved.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been talking about surface water. The real subterfuge is the so-called "unavoidable use" doctrine of the Department of the Interior, which is a new "gimmick" brought in to rationalize a project that should not have been approved in the first place. The "unavoidable use" doctrine gives an unjust enrichment to the large landowners, and they can continue to enjoy it in perpetuity.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat what Secretary Holum said:

No direct ground water percolation operations are planned in the Westlands area nor are facilities for such to be constructed.

What the Senator from Oregon is talking about is in derogation of the reclamation law which has been on the books since 1902. This is a surface distribution project. This would provide for the surface distribution of water only to landowners who comply with the reclamation law.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the Senator from Wisconsin 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The 160-acre limitation is a vital foundation stone of the congressional policy of helping the family farmer. Projects of this kind should benefit the family farmer. Congress has declared this as policy. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, agree on the policy of doing that.

Now we come to one of the very few opportunities, since I have been in the Senate, in 7 years, in which this principle of the family farm is at stake. Now we have an opportunity to stand up and be counted; to show whether or not we really believe it when we say that Federal farm policies should be for the family farmer—not the big corporate or monopoly farmer. Here is a project, the only project that has been before us in which a big proportion and, in this case, 70 percent of the benefits will flow to people who are not family farmers. The law is clear. Beneficiaries must not exceed the 160- or the 320-acre limitation. Those who receive the benefit obviously do it in violation of the limitation law. There is no basis in law for providing them with this benefit. And yet under the project funded by this appropriation bill 70 percent of the benefits would go to big farmers in flat, direct obvious violation of the law.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] said the benefits would be paid back in 40 years. But with what interest? Mr. President, under present law principal will be paid back without interest, with no interest. We would all like to get a multimillion dollar loan and pay it back in 40 years without interest. The present value of the enor-

mous amounts eventually involved in this bill far exceeds the future value of the principal when it is paid back over 40 years make no mistake about it. This is a subsidy. It is a clear subsidy. It is a subsidy of tens of millions of dollars to the big farmers in violation of the law.

It is said that the beneficiaries will have to divest themselves of their excess land. That is said by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. But there is no provision for enforcement. There is no requirement that they must do this. There is no sanction. It is clear that they can take their benefits. They will take their benefits. And that is it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not true that no water may be furnished to excess land unless the owner signs a contract in accordance with the reclamation law under which he must divest himself of his excess acreage at the end of a 10-year period?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We come to the same point.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is that right or wrong?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is talking about surface water. The testimony is very clear. A prime purpose of this project is to raise the water level 140 feet.

Mr. KUCHEL. What kind of water are we talking about?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is talking about subsurface water. The benefit is from the subsurface water. The Southern Pacific can sit on its thousands of acres, do nothing and enjoy an immense, multimillion-dollar increase in its land value at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. NELSON. This project has two purposes. One is to provide surface water, some of which will percolate, and the other is the objective of raising the underground table to 300 feet.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the main and principal purpose.

Mr. NELSON. I think not. They are both objectives of the project. I did not think the Senator wanted to leave that out.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not a problem for general law and general legislation? In the absence of a statutory provision, there is no regulation whatsoever. We are working at it piecemeal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the amendment, the Senator is asking, as the senior Senator from Oregon has said so well, that the house be put in order first. We are asking that the contract be signed first.

Unless we take the action proposed, there will be a breach, a serious breach in the 160-acre limitation. Those of us who feel very strongly about helping the family farmer will find that this prime protection for the family farmer may have disappeared, and with it the major specific protection now in the law.

This is the issue, Mr. President. Do Senators really believe in the family farm or not?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. We ought to have clarification of the contract. We should clear up this new "unavoidable use" doctrine, which is a new legislative "gimmick" of the Reclamation Bureau so far as I can see. As a result of the proposed project, the ground water level would be raised 300 feet, and there would be nothing to stop the large landowners from continuing to pump in perpetuity.

The contract we are talking about goes to surface water use and not the undue enrichment that the large landowners would receive from a raising of the underground water level to 300 feet. Then we could forget all about surface water thereafter. They would take the water out with underwater pumps. That is the gimmick.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 20 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, to the President vigorously protesting the Westland proposal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 31, 1964.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe a very serious perversion of law and public policy in administration of the Federal reclamation program will take place, unless you act promptly to stop action on the proposed \$157 million water distribution contract between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and Westlands Irrigation District in the San Luis unit, Federal service area, of the Central Valley project in California.

Unless the Senate Interior Committee rejects the proposed contract or the Secretary of the Interior withdraws the contract it will become effective after August 10, 1964.

The AFL-CIO and the California State Labor Federation are joined in strong opposition to the proposed Westlands contract. We believe it violates longstanding national policy in support of family-sized farms and in opposition to land monopolies.

The proposed Westlands contract will destroy the opportunity for family farm development in the Central Valley and it will give an unjustified windfall gain to the 23 large corporation farm operators who own 185,000 acres in the Westlands district, including the Southern Pacific Railroad, which owns 65,000 acres.

I am sure you are aware that the deep concern of the AFL-CIO about the Westlands contract is shared by the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and other church and citizen organizations which believe in family farm development. We have examined the contract and its consequences in great detail, and we believe the contract should be withdrawn, at least pending further opportunity for interested parties to present their views in more detail.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge you most strongly to direct the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw the Westlands contract and to review and to revise it in such ways



as will protect the interests of the United States and promote further development of the American family farm system.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,  
President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from James G. Patton of the Farmers Union to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1964.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The President,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am calling your attention to the Westlands water distribution system contract now before Congress which, in my opinion, represents a gigantic water steal.

The contract, as indicated in the attached memo, is a transparent scheme to subsidize large landowners in southern California. Huge corporate producers of beef surplus would be subsidized by the taxpayers to the detriment of family farmers.

The Westlands contract is opposed by the AFL-CIO, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and several other national and State organizations.

This contract is political dynamite and can be extremely embarrassing to a number of western Senators who are up for reelection this year.

We therefore urge that you order the contract withdrawn for review and technical changes. Action must be taken in the next few days to prevent the contract from going into effect.

Kindest personal regards.

Respectfully,

JAMES G. PATTON.

#### THE WESTLANDS WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM CONTRACT: A WATER STEAL

This contract, now before Congress for 90 days ending August 9, should be immediately withdrawn to correct technical details (such as giving the local district veto power to force alterations of any and all features of the \$157 million project after Congress appropriates funds).

It is a transparent scheme to let large landowners, including Southern Pacific with 120,000 acres, avoid the 160-acre limitation in the Reclamation Act. (Water admittedly flows underground to noncompilers.)

#### A WATER STEAL COMPARABLE TO TEAPOT DOME AND DIXON-YATES

It is headed for denunciation as a water steal with odious comparisons to Dixon-Yates and Teapot Dome.

#### HUGE CORPORATE PRODUCERS OF BEEF SURPLUS

It will flush out Interior's cancellation of millions of water debts of large landowners for other Sacramento River water, and the negotiation of a contract with them (including Kern County Land & Cattle Co., which recently bought control of J. I. Case (farm implement) Co. in a multimillion-dollar deal). The Kern Co. is a huge corporate contributor to beef surpluses.

Interior's defense is that the debts were not canceled—it was a "waiver of debts." (Former Solicitor Bennett of Interior was counsel for the irrigators although just out of office.)

OPPOSED ARE AFL-CIO, FARMERS UNION, NATIONAL GRANGE, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, AND OTHERS

The Westlands contract is opposed by numerous mass organizations, both California State and National, otherwise natural

allies of the administration. They include California State and National AFL-CIO, National Grange, National Farmers Union, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic Rural Life Association, Committee on Agricultural Life and Labor, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and many others.

A Senate floor demonstration is in the making led by WAYNE MORSE, PAUL DOUGLAS, and others, aimed at Tuesday, Wednesday, or late this week.

#### SENATORS ON HOT SPOT

On the hot spot in addition to California State and National administrations are, among others, FRANK MOSS, chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, and "SCOOP" JACKSON, chairman of the full Senate Interior Committee, as well as QUENTIN BURDICK, a member, and the whole House Interior Committee, all of whom must run this year. Pressure is on them to disapprove the contract.

#### RECOMMENDED ACTION

Withdraw the contract from Congress for technical change, or submit some minor change which would start the 90-day approval period running again, throwing final action on the contract into next year.

Respectfully submitted to President Lyndon B. Johnson by James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, July 29, 1964.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me review this situation in a little more detail. In June 1963 the Westlands District executed a previous contract with the Federal Government providing for annual deliveries of water to the district from a Federal dam and reservoir complex known as the San Luis unit. Construction of the San Luis unit itself was provided for in the same contract. The water deliveries are allegedly needed to raise the level of the water table in the entire Westlands District, which has apparently fallen over 100 feet. Two areas were to be served—a Federal service area and a State service area.

The present contract calls for the construction of water distribution facilities to be used for conveying and applying the water obligated to the district under last year's contract. A total of \$157 million is estimated as the construction cost. Included in this figure is \$106 million for the distribution system, \$10 million for a drainage system, and \$41 million for facilities to integrate surface water deliveries with ground water.

The Westlands contract was submitted to Congress for review on April 24, 1964. Congressional perusal was required by the San Luis Authorization Act of 1960, which prohibited the appropriation of funds for the construction of the project until the contract has been before Congress for 90 days. On July 8 of this year the Senate Interior Committee held hearings to consider the proposal. The committee has not taken any action on the project yet. But the 90-day period is about to expire. While there is no item in the public works appropriations bill before the Senate which pertains to the San Luis project, funds to start the project will undoubtedly be requested soon. An unsuccessful attempt was made in the House to grant funds for this plan, even before the 90-day period was up.

Mr. President, I have followed this controversial proposal closely since it was first introduced in 1959. At that

time, the legislation authorizing the San Luis project was debated vigorously in both the House and Senate. I took part in the debate over the question of whether the State service area involved in the project should be covered by standard reclamation law regulations. The original bill exempted the State service area from the 160-acre limitation traditionally included in reclamation contracts, and applied it solely to the Federal service area. Several Senators fought successfully to amend that bill so that the State service area as well as the Federal service area would be covered. Our amendment was justified because under the plan the State service area was to receive water conveyed through Federal facilities, and therefore had to be covered by the acreage limitations of Federal reclamation law.

Since 1902, when the Reclamation Act was passed, all lands which were to gain from federally financed water or water systems have been subject to acreage limitations. No water delivery or service could be made to lands which exceeded 160 acres in any one ownership or 320 acres owned by a husband and wife. All acreage which exceeds these limits is termed "excess land." These limitations have been consistently reaffirmed in subsequent acts and court decisions. While the enforcements of the limitations has often been irregular, their purpose has always been to encourage individual purchasers to build up small plots, and to provide equitable distribution of Federal aid from water projects. The acreage limitations have been protective measures for the family farm, insuring against land and water monopolies by railroads and other large landholders.

The acreage limitations are applied to particular lands through what is called a "recordable contract." By this agreement between individual landowners and the Interior Department, the landholder who wishes to receive Federal water is committed to sell all his excess lands within 10 years after the execution date of the contract. To avoid speculation, he is required to sell at a price not exceeding the value of his lands before project benefits, and to a person eligible to receive title to the lands. If a landowner fails to comply with this requirement within 10 years, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to make the disposition. A recordable contract is the only means by which an excess landowner can qualify his land for Federal water or service. It is therefore the only way excess land laws can be specifically implemented in connection with the Westlands District.

My position in regard to the authorization legislation for the San Luis project in 1959 was that the traditional principles of reclamation policy were being skirted in regard to the State service area. I did not oppose the intents and purposes of the water works itself, but was concerned that it be executed in line with the fundamentals of reclamation policy.

In reviewing the San Luis project as it appears again in the Westlands water distribution contract before us, I am



again disturbed about certain features of the plan, especially because of its insufficient regard for reclamation law. The challenges raised against this proposal in the recent hearings of the Senate Interior Committee convince me that this contract sets up an illegal subsidization of a few landowners with large holdings, at the expense of many small landowners.

This subsidization is brought about because a large ground reservoir underlies the entire Westlands District. The principal purpose of the San Luis project is to boost the water level of this widespread underground basin. The water carried by the proposed distribution system will be used for surface irrigation, in order that pumping from the underground basin can be reduced and the basin can be replenished. The falling of the water table can thus be halted. The resultant stabilization of the underground water level will benefit everyone with lands in the area, regardless of whether they are a party to the contract. Anyone who chooses to pump from the replenished basin can benefit from this project, even if they do not elect to enroll in the contract. Landowners will be asking themselves; "Why join the contract, be forced to sell my excess lands, and pay for the project, when I can reap the benefits without joining?"

Who are the landowners who will be subsidized in this curious way? Looking at the pattern of ownership in the valley to see who qualifies for project benefits and who does not, I am surprised to find that only 30 percent of the holdings in the area are eligible under the law—70 percent of the lands in the area are ineligible for San Luis water. In other words, 70 percent are what the Reclamation Bureau and reclamation calls excess lands, not eligible for water deliveries unless covered by recordable contracts. To become eligible for Federal help provided in this contract, 70 percent of the lands would have to be committed by a recordable contract for selling within 10 years at a price approved by the Interior Secretary.

Large landowners especially do not stand to gain by signing the Westlands contract. They can gain all the benefits of the San Luis water deliveries without signing a thing. It is more profitable simply to sit back and enjoy the benefits without Federal regulation and with no charge.

The distribution of benefits from this project has been so poorly planned that landowners ineligible under reclamation law will receive most of the benefits. These are the largest, and most powerful landholders in the area. They can exploit the project—in violation of reclamation principles—and obtain competitive advantages over their smaller neighbors who need the water and are supposed to be the beneficiaries.

The Interior Department has proposed no procedures guaranteeing observance of the law. Underground water reserves will be supplemented by this project and large landowners will draw upon these reserves with no restrictions and no charge.

Large farmholders already have deep wells and stand in less need of the additional water, though they will benefit from it. Small farmers cannot afford the deep wells and must rely on the water provided at or near the surface, for which taxes are imposed.

The 1960 San Luis Authorization Act included language applying the 160 acre limitation, standard in reclamation law, to all lands benefiting from Federal water facilities. But merely stating this applicability does not guarantee its enforcement in this case. Guarantee of enforcement is possible only through the signing of recordable contracts with individual landowners. Furthermore, language in last year's water service contracts suggests that these laws are going to be avoided. An unusual clause in the contract states that water "unavoidably" will be added to lands which may not be party to the contract, due to the underground conditions. The clause asserts that this unavoidable delivery of water to ineligible lands is not to be considered illegal under reclamation law. Thus, we have a violation of reclamation law built into the contract itself. Interior Department memoranda given to the Senate Interior Committee, moreover, express support for these procedures, procedures which are out of keeping with both the spirit and the letter of reclamation law.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the contemplated delivery of water to the Westlands district benefiting eligible and ineligible lands alike constitutes a clear violation of reclamation law. Only landowners who have placed their excess lands under recordable contracts are eligible for Federal benefits. But this contract sanctions a delivery of water to lands not so committed, for it provides for the supplementation of underground water reserves helping all landowners who choose to pump up the increase, regardless of whether they sign the contract or not. This violation of reclamation law and the subsidy it sanctions is my major objection to the Westlands contract.

The violation of longstanding principles in this contract has potentially wide and far-reaching implications.

First. It establishes a dangerous precedent, for it makes future enforcement of acreage limitations of reclamation law difficult, and it thus leaves the Federal Government open to huge financial losses in water projects. If a water project designed to encourage and aid the family farm is turned over to the aggrandizement of big landowners, the project has failed in its purposes and is a waste of Federal money and America's resources. If traditional reclamation principles are compromised in this instance, there is little reason to believe that attempts will be made in the future to direct benefits to America's family farms and to keep Federal projects from slipping into the hands of rich landowners.

Policy in the Central Valley water projects has been to construct water facilities first and then to round up signers to the contract. Reclamation Bureau officials have claimed that this procedure

will also be used in connection with the Westlands contract. They claim that there is no need to wait on construction for agreements with the landowners of the area, because more lands will be enrolled after it is started. They have stated that no water will be delivered until the lands receiving it are all covered by the necessary recordable contracts. But Congress has received from them only promises and expectations that there will be general support for the project among local landowners. Reclamation officials can offer no guarantees. And yet, they do not hesitate to come to us for money to start building the waterworks, even though they have no recordable contracts in hand as yet.

In what kind of bargaining position is the Federal Government going to be trying to uphold reclamation law as it goes about rounding up signers to this contract among large, powerful landowners with a vast, expensive water system on its hands?

The capacity of the Reclamation Bureau to enforce acreage limitations, as is its proper task in meting out Federal water benefits, is seriously compromised. Again I emphasize that 70 percent of the land in the area is not eligible at present, and would have to be sold eventually to be eligible. Landowners in the area have long opposed the acreage limitations, and have stated in the past that they will not submit to them. If enforcement of the limitations here is lax or lacking altogether, though, the way is open to land and water monopoly.

Basic reclamation law stands in direct opposition to such tendencies. We must uphold reclamation law in the Westlands District and avoid a sellout to big land interests.

Second. Think of the wider ramifications of this, the largest contract of its kind, on other domestic and foreign matters. A circumvention of reclamation law as is contemplated in this project is inconsistent with current domestic farm and labor policy and in direct contradiction to land reform themes in our foreign aid policy.

Mr. President, the need for congressional action on this huge water project is based on more than criticisms which I have brought before the Congress, though I think these sufficient to call for a closer investigation of the project. Requests from the Interior Department and the Justice Department have actually been made to Congress for legislative decisions affecting the terms and administration of the Westlands District. Congress has been asked to lay down some rules for the handling of this project before construction begins. The opportunity to lay down these rules is afforded by the 90-day period of legislative review. Let me quote the words of the Solicitor, Frank J. Barry, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in the hearing before the Senate Interior Committee. In discussing the question of the legality and wisdom of the "unavoidable" clause, Solicitor Barry says:

This, of course, is a matter for consideration by the Congress \* \* \* that is, the question of recharging the underground and the



benefit that might be obtained by an excess landowner who does not sign a recordable contract but who takes advantage of the fact that the underground is recharged \* \* \* do not want to give a legal opinion here. I would prefer to study the matter with considerable care \* \* \*. I cannot say at this point whether it is illegal for the United States to supply water under these conditions; or whether we can legally require a person who gets these "unavoidable" benefits to comply with the excess land laws; that is, require him to sign a recordable contract.

Congressional decisions on the projects were also requested by the Justice Department. Their request was for a clear-cut judgment on whether the State service area is to be covered by the acreage limitations. In a letter to the Secretary of the Interior in 1960, the Attorney General expressed doubts about the legality of exempting the State service area, and asked for congressional review of that question. He said:

I would urge you to seek congressional re-examination of this question. I think that Congress itself should make a clear determination whether or not the acreage limitations should apply in the State service area. Fortunately, under the provisions of the San Luis Act, they will have the opportunity to do so, and I sincerely hope that they will take positive action in this respect.

Mr. President, Congress's responsibility in this matter is clear. This must be brought out into the open and discussed. I would not want to see this project begun, with the questionable procedures it is about to employ, without some analysis on our parts.

Indeed, after careful individual study on my part, I have concluded that the Westlands contract in its present form deserves neither approval nor appropriations from Congress. Congress cannot permit this project to go into effect until more guarantee is given us that the project is going to be a legal venture in compliance with reclamation law, and also, that it is going to be a sound investment in the best interests of U.S. domestic and foreign policy. As it stands now, I find so many faults with the terms and conditions of the contract, that I question it from both a legal and economic standpoint.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to ask the Senator from California one or two questions. First, is it known what crops will probably be grown in that area?

Mr. KUCHEL. There would be the usual prohibition against price-supported crops that has been written into reclamation statutes; it would be written into this one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the area about which we are speaking a fruit and vegetable area?

Mr. KUCHEL. It includes fruit and vegetable farms.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the farmers out there knew that the proposal involved a subsidy, they would not be supporting it. I happen to work in areas closely associated with fruit and vegetable farmers. If there is one thing to which they are opposed, it is a subsidy. I wonder if there have been hearings so that those farmers could come in and learn what this is all about.

Mr. KUCHEL. There have been long hearings on the project for years and just recently on this contract itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Where are the hearings published?

Mr. NELSON. There are about five copies of the hearings. They have not been printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Faced as we are with diametrically opposite views as to what the facts are, this is no time to make a decision.

Mr. NELSON. I stand corrected. I thought the Senator referred to the hearings conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 3 weeks ago or thereabouts. Those have not been printed. I do not know of any other hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thought there were hearings, but I could not find copies. That is the reason I made the statement. When we are faced with absolutely opposite opinions on facts, I do not believe that is the way to legislate. I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the

Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

Also, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 521 Leg.]

YEAS—23

|          |          |                |
|----------|----------|----------------|
| Bartlett | McGovern | Neuberger      |
| Burdick  | McNamara | Proxmire       |
| Dodd     | Metcalf  | Ribicoff       |
| Douglas  | Monroney | Robertson      |
| Gore     | Morse    | Thurmond       |
| Gruening | Moss     | Williams, N.J. |
| Hart     | Muskie   | Williams, Del. |
| McCarthy | Nelson   |                |

NAYS—57

|              |               |                |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Aiken        | Ervin         | McGee          |
| Allott       | Fong          | McIntyre       |
| Bayh         | Fulbright     | Mechem         |
| Beall        | Hartke        | Miller         |
| Bennett      | Hayden        | Morton         |
| Bible        | Hickenlooper  | Mundt          |
| Boggs        | Hill          | Pastore        |
| Brewster     | Holland       | Pell           |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hruska        | Prouty         |
| Carlson      | Inouye        | Randolph       |
| Case         | Jackson       | Russell        |
| Church       | Javits        | Salinger       |
| Cooper       | Jordan, N.C.  | Saltonstall    |
| Cotton       | Jordan, Idaho | Simpson        |
| Curtis       | Kuchel        | Smathers       |
| Dirksen      | Long, Mo.     | Smith          |
| Dominick     | Long, La.     | Stennis        |
| Eastland     | Magnuson      | Tower          |
| Ellender     | McClellan     | Young, N. Dak. |

NOT VOTING—20

|           |           |             |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Anderson  | Johnston  | Sparkman    |
| Byrd, Va. | Keating   | Symington   |
| Cannon    | Kennedy   | Talmadge    |
| Clark     | Lausche   | Walters     |
| Edmondson | Mansfield | Yarborough  |
| Goldwater | Pearson   | Young, Ohio |
| Humphrey  | Scott     |             |

So Mr. NELSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.



## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day, and perhaps Saturday, if there is to be a Saturday session.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be a Saturday session.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge, there are no further amendments to be offered. I hope that is a statement of fact. It is intended, with the passage of the public works appropriation bill, which has been so ably handled by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his counterpart the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], that the Senate will return to the foreign aid bill.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], on behalf of himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], will offer an amendment. The Senator from Oregon has amendments. The Senator from South Carolina has amendments. The Senator from Louisiana has amendments. Other Senators have amendments.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state now that I shall ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator has put the Senate on notice. It also anticipated that the Senate will take up the military construction bill, along with the foreign aid bill. It is not anticipated that the military construction bill will take long. There may be further votes on the foreign aid bill tomorrow.

It is also possible that we may find the time to take up the agricultural appropriation bill, although that may have to wait until Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to pursue this matter a little further. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether the matter of a Saturday session is open to negotiation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not if we wish to get away by the 22d, which is beginning to look more and more doubtful every day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wished to couple the suggestion with the hope that perhaps a limitation on amendments might be obtained in the interest of expedition, so that we might gain in the sense of time rather than lose by getting a respite on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am interested in that. I have made some soundings as to a limitation of time, and I have met with several rebuffs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would offer my mediatory and conciliatory services to the majority leader, if that objective—namely, a respite on Saturday—might be consummated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator can obtain a limitation on time, I will give

most serious consideration to his proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ascertain from the distinguished majority leader, if I can, how long he contemplates spending on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As long as the amendments keep coming.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Amendments on the foreign aid bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. Will the Chair tell us what is transpiring between the leaders? We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From what the Chair has heard, they are engaging in a little colloquy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question of the distinguished minority leader, the Senate will be in session as long as amendments to the foreign aid bill keep rolling. With the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Kansas, and other Senators having amendments to offer, I would anticipate that the amendments would continue to roll for some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Tennessee did not hear me, I was asking the distinguished majority leader to suggest to me where I might pour the balm of Gilead in order to secure limitation on debate on amendments to the foreign aid bill, in the interest of expedition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will be able to obtain a limitation.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President I had intended to present two amendments to the bill, but the vote in the full committee was so overwhelming that I decided not to propose the amendments. However, after the bill has been read the third time, I shall make a brief statement on these two projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not believe any public works appropriation bill could pass the Senate without a tremendous amount of work being put into it by the distinguished Senator from

Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

I often say that I have the most complicated appropriation bill in the Senate. However, I know of no bill that requires longer work than the pending bill, which involves the interrogation of literally hundreds of witnesses on the projects, and the hearing of both sides. It is necessary to go into the benefit-cost ratio and engineering studies. The staff works the year round on these matters.

I wish to pay tribute to the subcommittee for the fine work it has done on the bill.

This bill is often referred to as a pork-barrel bill. We hear it said on the floor, and we also read of it in the media of communication. I say to those who term these projects pork-barrel projects that they have not studied them. I have said on many occasions to people who have thrown that expression at me, "You show me a program or a project in the United States that Congress has already authorized and funded that can be called a pork-barrel project, and I will vote with you." Every one of these projects is worthwhile moneywise, and will help the country through taxes and through the creation of more wealth. One of the reasons we are the great country we are is that we enact the kind of legislation we are enacting today. To those who look at a project and say, "I do not know about this," I say, "Ten years from now you will be glad that we included it, in the interest of an expanding population and economy."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like the RECORD to show that I, too, pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. They deal with a very important matter. They are always fair and courteous to all Members of the Senate, and they handle these projects in a most excellent way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Washington. Hour after hour, day after day, the Senator from Louisiana and his fellow members on the committee have listened to hundreds of witnesses testify to the need for the projects. I particularly wish to thank the distinguished Senator and his associates on the Committee on Public Works for the investigation they made of the great Arkansas River project. This, as Senators know, was the favorite project of the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma.

Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana and his associates, this project was kept on schedule. We are also grateful to the President for sending forward supplemental appropriation requests for \$14 million. This made it possible to keep the project on schedule. It will supply a job rate of 14,000 to 15,000 a year.

It would have increased the land cost by \$800,000 and would have meant a loss of \$42,500,000 in annual benefits.

It is interesting to note the work that will be provided. Some 14,000 or 15,000



jobs will be created in an area where, in 23 out of 27 counties through which the project will pass, the per-family income is less than \$3,000.

This will be an investment in the future. The record will show that the benefit-to-cost ratio is \$1.40 for each dollar invested.

All the projects that have been approved by the committee have always been successful. We have always saved in the earlier construction more than 5 percent of what the cost would have been had the projects been postponed.

Like many other projects, this one will help to create a prosperous, healthy, and strong America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the Senator from Washington and other Senators concerning the superb national service performed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. The benefits of this piece of legislation, as the Senator from Washington has so ably said, will flow across the whole Nation.

I am sure I speak the unanimous sentiment of the Senate when I say that this is one more example of how devotion to public duty and indefatigable labor have brought us a bill which we can be proud to send on its way to the White House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, probably the most ably handled portion of any piece of legislation of this kind is in the field of reclamation, in which the knowledge of the distinguished Senator from Arizona is invaluable. He has probably forgotten more about reclamation and its benefits than many persons know.

I wish also to compliment the able staff—Paul Eaton and the other staff members—for their devotion to this work. The country would not be what it is if it were not for men of the caliber of those of whom we are speaking today. I salute the Senator from Arizona and his able staff.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish it were possible for me, in a few words, to make those who read these words understand how much labor and study are involved in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate and passing it today. I pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished ranking minority member [Mr. HRUSKA]. They have to say "No" a great many times, but they always find a pleasant way to say it. They can say it pleasantly because, by reason of the many hours they spend on the bill, they know literally hundreds of different items by heart, together with the feasibility studies and statistics that back them up.

If these words will help someone to understand the great amount of effort, work, diligence, and devotion that have gone into the bill, I shall feel amply re-

paid. I desired to pay my tribute to those two Senators today.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield time to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the service that the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee have rendered to the people of Utah. They accepted amendment No. 1198, offered by my colleague and me, for a project which, while small in importance—a matter of \$200,000—was crucial to an important area of my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared describing this particular project may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT—MORGAN COUNTY ROAD TO SERVE EAST CANYON RESERVOIR

The road in question, Utah Highway 66, runs from Morgan south, through Porterville, as a paved road. About 2 miles south of Porterville the pavement ends, and it becomes a rough, barely graveled, county road which traverses the remaining 4.4 miles to the East Canyon Dam. The road is narrow, with many sections unable to accommodate the passing of two normal-sized vehicles. It follows the winding contours of the canyon, with many dangerous curves, steep dugways, and extreme grades. It must be realigned and paved to meet minimum secondary road requirements to accommodate the greatly increased traffic which will be generated by the enlargement of East Canyon Reservoir and the planned recreational and fish and wildlife developments.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the costs of realignment and improvement of the 4.4-mile section of road to meet minimum secondary road requirements would be \$200,000, which is the amount approved by the Appropriations Committee.

EAST CANYON DAM AND RESERVOIR—PRESENT ENLARGEMENT

Construction has recently commenced on the East Canyon Dam, which will cost about \$2.5 million. An arch-type concrete dam, 245 feet high and 440 feet long at the crest, it is being built just 20 feet downstream from the existing 49-year-old, privately built East Canyon Dam. The new structure will stand 55 feet higher than the old dam, and the East Canyon Reservoir capacity will be increased from 28,000 acre-feet to 52,000 acre-feet. The dam is located near Morgan, Utah, on East Canyon Creek, a tributary of the Weber River.

RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to spend \$296,000 for recreational developments at the reservoir, with construction of these facilities to begin in fiscal year 1965. Public use facilities will include access roads and parking areas, boat launching ramp and moorage, picnic and camping units, sanitary facilities and water supply. Concession facilities will include marina developments, rental boats, and a concession building. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the annual public use at this reservoir will be approximately 30,000 visitor-days.

JUSTIFICATION FOR ROAD AS NONREIMBURSABLE COST CHARGEABLE TO RECREATION

Since the major use of the road will be by travelers to the recreation facilities at the East Canyon Reservoir, the improvements

should not be charged to the water users but should be considered a recreational expense, chargeable to the general public. The committee concurred in approving the \$200,000 for road improvement as a nonreimbursable cost chargeable to recreation.

In this regard, Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in a letter addressed to Senator BENNETT, dated February 6, 1964, said:

"You are, of course, familiar with cases where funds have been provided by the Congress for the improvement of local roads leading to Reclamation construction sites. In such cases, funds for road improvements have been authorized in the House or Senate Appropriations Committees by specific method in the reports on appropriation bills. Because of the recreation developments at the reservoir in this instance, an alternative might be to have language included in the appropriation act authorizing additional nonreimbursable funds chargeable to recreation for improvement of the road in question. The latter method would resolve any question as to the authority for declaring the road nonreimbursable."

OTHER ROADS TO EAST CANYON RESERVOIR—ADVANTAGES OF MORGAN ROUTE

The Morgan County road is one of three access routes to the damsite. A second road runs southwesterly from the town of Henefer, and a third road extends from the south end of East Canyon Reservoir to Salt Lake City. None of the roads, however, is improved all the way. The Bureau of Reclamation has elected to use the Henefer route for its use during construction of the East Canyon Dam, for the reason that the contractor's hauling problem would be largely confined to that side of the damsite, since cement would come from the Devil's Slide plant by way of Henefer.

However, the fishermen, boaters and picnickers who will use the recreation facilities at East Canyon Reservoir will come, for the most part, from Weber and Davies Counties and neighboring counties to the north, who would be better served by the Morgan route. It is 15 miles shorter from the north to go by Morgan rather than by Henefer. Moreover, the Morgan route could be kept open 2 months longer each year than the Henefer route because of its sunny exposure. The completion of the highway from Morgan to the East Canyon area would be one of the State's most beautiful and scenic drives, a fact that adds to its anticipated popularity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. None of us who are members of the Committee on Appropriations wants to forget the excellent work that Ken Bousquet does on the bill. He knows all the projects by heart. His knowledge of the subject is most helpful to all of us.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield time to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, on which I serve, are the authorizing committees for most of the items in this appropriation bill. Therefore, I have direct knowledge of the appropriations process. I wish to pay my tribute to the Senators who have worked so diligently on the bill.

I came to the Chamber this afternoon to offer an amendment to the bill. Fortunately, it was not necessary to argue in behalf of the amendment; it was adopted by a voice vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the



RECORD a statement I have prepared in justification of the amendment, and which illustrates the careful but far-reaching, broad work of the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

I support the amendment offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. HAYDEN, which will add to the public works appropriation bill (H.R. 11579) the sum of \$200,000 for the improvement, on a nonreimbursable basis, of a road to the site of the East Canyon Dam, in Morgan County, Utah. The Senate Appropriations Committee has already approved this provision by majority vote.

As background for discussion of the merits of the provision, I would like first to tell you something about Morgan County, Utah. It is one of our smaller counties, only 610 square miles in size. It is entirely mountainous. The only settlements are along the floor of a canyon which parallels the Weber River. The county seat is also called Morgan, but there are several other communities. The entire county, however, has a population of only 3,000, or 4.7 persons per square mile. It has a very, very limited assessed valuation—in fact, most of the county is owned by the Federal Government. There is very little money for building or improving county roads, or meeting other county needs.

East Canyon Dam just happens to be located in Morgan County. Most of its benefits go to Weber County, where Ogden is located, and to Davis County and South Box Elder County, which are semimetro-politan areas.

The dam is now being enlarged as a project of the Weber Basin Conservancy District, under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation. Its enlargement will increase water for Ogden and other areas, with only about 5 percent of the benefits going to Morgan County.

The enlargement will also enhance the recreational values of the dam and its environs, which already attract large numbers of fishermen, boaters and other outdoor enthusiasts from both Ogden and Salt Lake. So, after enlargement of the reservoir, roads to the dam will be even more heavily traveled.

The question at issue is simply an approach road to the dam and which road should be improved for the use of the engineering personnel and construction crews. It is logical, it seems to me, to improve the shortest road for use of construction crews and which can also be used later on by recreationists. But the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed to put whatever improvements are necessary on a longer road which will have no special recreation value or other value after the dam is constructed.

I have here a map of the area, and I would like to show you the two roads under question. I shall call them the Porterville Road and the Henefer Road. The construction camp has already been located at Porterville about halfway between Morgan and the damsite. The Henefer Road runs east and south from Morgan and then up Dixie Hollow to the east side of the dam. It is about 11 miles to the damsite from Morgan through Porterville, and 7 miles from Porterville itself to the dam. It is almost 30 miles from Porterville to the damsite through Morgan and Henefer.

Between Porterville and the dam, there is a 4.4-mile stretch of road which parallels the East Canyon stream. This is a scenic road, passing through a rugged section of the canyon. In many stretches, two normal-sized vehicles cannot pass. There are dangerous curves, inadequate bridges, and steep grades.

It is a country road. To be useful it should be widened and bridges must be enlarged.

What Morgan County has asked, therefore, is improvement of the 4.4-mile stretch so that the shortest road to the damsite, and the road which will be used later on by recreationists, can carry the burden of dam construction workers and equipment, rather than the longer road which will not have nearly as great permanent or general value to the county.

The Bureau of Reclamation has decided to use the Henefer Road, insisting that improvements on the road will not be required. However, the Morgan County commissioners tell me that the Bureau of Reclamation has misjudged the situation. They say that the road from Henefer to the East Canyon Dam cannot be used without considerable improvement. It is mainly the old Mormon pioneer trail. It is used now primarily by ranchers in the area. Five and four-tenths miles of this road have not been improved. Morgan County commissioners say that heavy construction trucks will have a hard time getting over this Henefer Road, and that if they do try to use it in its present condition, it will soon be cut up badly. The road will then have to be improved, and any improvement will cost money. So road improvement money must go into the project, one way or another.

The slender tax resources of Morgan County are inadequate for improvement of either road. Since some road has to be improved, it is just good commonsense to widen, grade, and improve the canyon road which is the shortest route to the damsite, and which recreationists from Salt Lake and the entire area are going to use as soon as the dam is enlarged.

An unsafe road breeds accidents and trouble for construction personnel and, later, for county officials. My request is that the Federal Government assume the responsibility for constructing a safe road. This is not unreasonable.

And, as Members of this body know, there is considerable precedent for granting such a request. There have been a number of instances in the past where funds have been provided for by the Congress of local roads leading to reclamation construction sites. I point out that in the fiscal year 1962 report on the public works appropriation bill (H.R. 9076) the program for the Yellowstone unit of the Missouri River Basin was increased by \$192,000 so that the Bureau of Reclamation could use the money to construct FAS Route 313 between Yellowstone Dam and St. Xavier, Mont. (S. Rept. 1097, 87th Cong., 1st sess.) In the 1963 report of the public works appropriation bill, it is noted that the committee directs that not more than \$95,000 of the amount for the Seedskaadee participating project, Wyoming, be utilized for placing an asphalt surface on the Lincoln County, Wyo., road between U.S. Highway 189 and the Bureau of Reclamation community of Fontenelle. (Rept. 2178, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

These are fully parallel situations with the East Canyon Dam road in Utah. In both instances the roads were to recreation sites, and in both instances were nonreimbursable.

I submit, therefore, that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to add to the bill before us the item of \$200,000 for the improvement of a road to the East Canyon Dam site in Morgan, Utah, should be accepted.

The action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee in writing the \$200,000 into the bill was based on a clear understanding of the issues involved, and was equitable and fair. It was also based on sound precedent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will some Senator yield time to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the citizens of my State, I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who have brought to us today H.R. 11579.

Although I believe the inclusion in the bill of the Westlands water project was a great mistake, the bill in its totality is very much in the public interest. I am appreciative of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, even though I disagree with the mistakes the committee makes now and then, as all of us do, such as its recent mistake with respect to the Tongue Point issue.

Be that as it may, the bill and the committee report which accompanied it are of major importance to the Pacific Northwest. I am particularly pleased that the committee, in its report in discussing the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, saw fit to include the directive to the Secretary of the Interior, found on page 37 of the report which states:

With respect to the intertie lines, the committee approves the existing policy of the Department to the effect that it will not enter into contracts which call for wheeling charges greater than Federal costs for such service, or which do not provide to the Department wheeling capacity in the lines to meet its full requirements. It is the desire of the committee that all such contracts be made public and be transmitted to the Senate not less than 60 days before their effective dates.

It may be recalled that the other evening, in a major speech I made on the intertie issue, I said that in the absence of protection such as this, I would in January introduce a bill to guarantee public review. So long as the Department of the Interior complies with these instructions of the Committee on Appropriations, such legislation may not be necessary, although it may be safer to have it passed. This recognition by the committee of the exceedingly important principle that matters affecting the public shall be open for public inspection and congressional review, reflects the excellent judgment of the committee and is a hallmark of sound legislation.

As an Oregonian, I am deeply appreciative of the consideration which has been accorded to Oregon projects by the committee. I particularly wish to express my appreciation to the committee for having increased the 40-foot channel on the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers amount by \$500,000 over the budget estimates, and for having included under the flood control and power projects the \$130,000 for planning for the Elk Creek Reservoir. This, together with the \$150,000 allocated for planning on the Applegate Reservoir, will enable work to be started on these vitally needed improvements.

Senate approval of \$47,175,000 for start of construction on Pacific Northwest-Southwest transmission interties by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration is of far-reaching significance for Oregon's future economic development.



I am particularly pleased that the committee has included provisions for all-Federal ownership of two transmission lines, protection of public preference customers, and congressional review of wheeling agreements with private power companies in conformance with the recommendations to the Appropriations Committee of the Oregon Senators.

Interties will permit marketing of about \$20 million of surplus power from the Bonneville system now wasting to the sea, thus helping to stabilize our region's postage-stamp power rate. The transmission system will give the West world leadership in development of direct current transmission technology, and assure the joining together of Federal generating facilities with federally owned lines.

The report in this respect will be of great service to the entire West, including not only my State, but an area as far east as Montana.

I want the Committee on Appropriations to know that I sincerely appreciate the assistance they have been to the West in connection with the sound projects that have been approved in this report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, I expressed appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this appropriation, to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and to the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation.

I also extend my sincere thanks to the staffs of both committees who have been so helpful in Kansas projects.

Title 2 of the bill contains an item for the Glen Elder Reservoir of \$8,400,000, one of the key reservoirs in the Missouri Basin on the Kansas River.

The construction of this dam will result in the need for the building of substantial dikes around the city of Downs, Kans.

This is a problem which has caused me great concern. On several occasions, I have consulted Commissioner Floyd E. Domy, of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the aKnsas City district of the office of the Corps of Engineers. Those agencies have been most cooperative in making further studies in regard to a relocation of the dam.

I called this matter to the attention of the committee, and have on several occasions visited with members of the committee, urging that every consideration be given to the problem that faces this particular community, which is so vitally affected.

I am advised by all concerned in the agencies, and by Members of Congress, that this project is so far along that no delaying action should be taken at this time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Earlier this year, after the disastrous floods in the Ohio River valley, my colleague and I introduced a resolution asking the Corps of Engineers to reexamine certain proposed flood protection facilities for communities along the Ohio River and tributaries of the Ohio—facilities proposed for areas around towns such as Bellevue, Dayton, Ludlow, and Bromley, among others. On the Licking River, which flows into the Ohio, they found an authorized reservoir project of Falmouth, Ky., which had been placed on a deferred status several years ago. The Corps of Engineers provided funds and has been making a study, because it is very important to try to provide flood protection for Falmouth. I know this, because I asked about it on several occasions, most recently at the final meeting of the Appropriations Committee the day before yesterday, on Wednesday of this week. The Corps of Engineers had not reported to the committee. The Bureau of the Budget had recommended no funds. Let me ask, has that situation changed?

Mr. ELLENDER. There has been no change in the classification of the Falmouth project, but the study is being pursued in connection with the study being made of the Licking River, as I recall. I hope this report will be submitted soon, so that we can consider the Falmouth project next year.

Mr. COOPER. If the Corps of Engineers does report favorably, which I anticipate it will, can this matter be considered in its proper order?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

I wish to emphasize that the study of the economic feasibility of this project is being made in connection with a study of the Licking River area.

Mr. COOPER. Do I correctly understand that it is the practice of the committee, under the leadership of its chairman, not to appropriate funds until the Corps of Engineers has made a recommendation to the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I also want to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his very fair and courteous and just treatment of all the projects in Kentucky. His attention and his efforts through the years have been of great help to our Nation, not only in my own State but throughout the United States, and I again thank him for his work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated in my original statement, I opposed two projects under titles II and IV dealing with the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie and another in title IV dealing with the TVA.

The President sent recommendations to the Congress increasing the budget by \$45.5 million for the intertie which

we have heard about from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. This intertie has been studied for some time.

The argument advanced for the intertie is that a large amount of power is going to waste and that the intertie would be beneficial in that this surplus or dump power could be sold in the Southwest, thereby furnishing funds to enable the Bonneville Power Authority to be able to discharge its financial obligations.

For the past 2 or 3 years, the Bonneville Power Administration has not taken in sufficient funds to meet all of its obligations.

Notwithstanding that fact, money is provided in the bill to start construction of one of the last two dams on the Snake River, a tributary of the great Columbia River.

It seems to me that this proposed intertie should be receiving more study, particularly in view of the fact that under the treaty we entered into with Canada in January of 1961 and ratified by Canada a few months ago, we have obligated ourselves to purchase from Canada—and when I say "we," I do not mean the Government, I mean some of the people as well as corporations in the United States—for 30 years in advance, the electricity to which Canada will be entitled after the completion of the construction of three projects in Canada.

The bonds, I understand, for payment to Canada, have not yet been sold, but they will be offered on the market some time soon, since the funds must be available by October 1, 1964 or the Canadian ratification is void.

In accordance with agreement reached between United States and Canadian representatives on January 22, 1964, the United States agreed to use its best efforts to arrange for the sale in the United States, for a 30-year period, of the share of the downstream power benefits to which Canada would be entitled under the Columbia River treaty. Initially this share would amount to about 1,400,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity and about 4 billion kilowatt-hours of energy. At the end of 30 years these benefits will have declined to about 330,000 kilowatts dependable capacity and about 2 billion kilowatt-hours.

That is a great amount of electricity. It seems to me that study should have been made as to what will be done with the extra electricity.

The terms specified for the sale of Canadian entitlement provide that Canada will receive a net \$254,400,000 in U.S. funds on October 1, 1964.

That is one part of the Canadian reservation which I did not like.

This lump sum was computed on the basis of \$5.50 per kilowatt year for peaking capacity plus 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour for energy, applied to the estimated Canadian share over the 30-year period after initial operation of each project. This is equivalent to 3.75 mills per kilowatt-hour at 60-percent load factor.

As Senators know, it has been decided that the U.S. Government will pay to Canada \$64.4 million in flood control



benefits which will inure to us if, as, and when Canada builds these three projects.

Canada will build the Arrow Lakes, Duncan Lake, and Mica storage dams in Canada at Canadian expense. These projects will provide 15½ million acre-feet of usable storage. Canada will also give permission for the United States to build the Libby project and will provide the reservoir area located in Canada at its own expense. But it is a strange thing that the total cost of these three dams happens almost to agree with the \$254.4 million that Canada demands of us. That will have to be paid to Canada on or before October 1 of this year.

If that sum is added to the flood benefits that we are to receive, if, as, and when these three dams are constructed—and that amounts to \$64.4 million—those two figures added together will be far in excess of \$300 million. It is about \$15 million less than the entire cost of constructing the three dams. It is my belief that this is another classic example of how soft good old Uncle Sam is.

#### U.S. RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THE TREATY

The dams which Canada will build will provide power and flood control benefits in the United States. Under the treaty, Canada is entitled to one-half of the power gain resulting from the treaty at plants in the United States. It is this entitlement for which arrangements are being made for sale in the United States at a price of \$254.4 million. For the use of the storage for flood control, the United States is to pay Canada \$64.4 million (a portion to be paid upon completion of each storage project) as the estimated worth of one-half of the flood control benefits that the Canadian storage provides American property.

There may be occasions when additional flood control storage is desired, in which case there may be an additional payment amounting to \$7.5 million.

It goes without saying that the quarter of a billion dollars will have to be paid by the people of this country, in that it will have to be absorbed somehow by the power users through the corporations or the persons who will float this huge bond issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I be allowed to continue for two additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to continue for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, how much time does the minority have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain data in connection with this proposal between the United States and Canada.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CANADIAN OBLIGATIONS UNDER COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

President Eisenhower's letter of January 17, 1961, transmitting the treaty to the Senate pointed out that the treaty envisages the construction in the Columbia River Basin in Canada, within a period of 9 years, of reservoirs providing 15.5 million acre-feet of storage. That communication points out that the initial power benefits realizable in the United States from Canadian storage under the treaty are comparable to another Grand Coulee Dam—the total initial result is a gain to the United States of over 1,686,000 kilowatts of low-cost prime power (including the 544,000-kilowatt installation which we could make at Libby).

A current evaluation of the total power gain resulting from the Treaty shows that, in rounded figures, the United States and Canada will each gain initially about 1,400,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity and about 4 billion kilowatt-hours of annual energy. These gains will decrease in time, amounting to about 330,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity and 2 billion kilowatt-hours of annual energy for each country at the end of 30 years. The Canadian gain, however, will be sold to a purchaser in the United States for a 30-year period for a price of \$254.4 million as of October 1, 1964.

The Senate committee report on the treaty points out that the Canadians are to construct projects at Mica Creek, at Arrow Lakes, and on one or more tributaries of the Kootenai River near Duncan Lake, British Columbia, at an estimated cost of \$345 million. The additional storage will more than double that presently available for regulation of the flows of the main stem of the Columbia River.

For flood control, the plan provides for 7,100,000 acre-feet in Arrow Lakes; 1,270,000 acre-feet in the Duncan Lake area; and 80,000 acre-feet near Mica Creek. The total storage capacity of 8,450,000 acre-feet for flood control has been evaluated as having an annual benefit of \$5,700,000. The treaty provides for payment on account of this storage of lump sums aggregating \$64,400,000 based on capitalization of one-half of the annual flood control benefits at an interest rate of 3½ percent.

The treaty, therefore, presently contemplates that the United States will make payments to the Canadians totaling \$318.8 million, of which \$254.4 million is for the Canadian power entitlement within the United States for a period of 30 years, and \$64.4 million is for flood control benefits in the United States resulting from Canadian storage.

A more recent estimate of the cost to Canada, based on information received in September of 1962, indicates that the cost to Canada of work required under the treaty will amount to \$402,500,000, Canadian dollars, or \$374,400,000, U.S. dollars. This included reservoir costs for the Libby project but did not include generating machinery at Mica. (The cost of construction to Canada was not the basis upon which the United States agreed to undertake to arrange for the sale of Canada's downstream power entitlement at a price of \$254.4 million U.S. dollars.)

Under date of July 13, 1964, the New York Times carried a news item indicating that British Columbia's Premier Bennett was proposing a study of the Columbia, Peace, Frazier, and Yukon Rivers. That article indicated that this proposal of the Premier of British Columbia could cloud the issue of ratification and the implementation of the

Columbia River Treaty. The International Joint Commission has informed me that they expect there will be no delay in the exchange of ratifications if the United States provides the lump-sum payment for the Canadian entitlements.

Source of funds for purchase of Canadian entitlement:

In accordance with plans now underway, the purchase price will be paid in its entirety by the Columbia River Power Exchange, a non-profit organization incorporated in the State of Washington. The Federal Government will not contribute any of the \$254.4 million.

#### STATUS OF BONDS

The bonds have not yet been offered for sale. It is understood, however, that discussion with financial advisers, etc., are now in process looking towards the sale of the bonds prior to October 1, 1964.

Present power rates: The Bonneville Power Administration is currently marketing power at 2 mills per kilowatt at 100-percent load factor. Some large blocks of energy are sold at 90-percent load factor, which works out to be 2.2 mills per kilowatt.

Principal purchasers by classes: During fiscal year 1963, the principal purchasers of Bonneville Power were:

|                                | Percent |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| Publicly owned utilities.....  | 43.7    |
| Aluminum plants.....           | 30.3    |
| Privately owned utilities..... | 11.3    |
| Federal agencies.....          | 9.3     |
| Other industries.....          | 5.4     |
| Total.....                     | 100     |

Their average load factor is 67.5 percent, which constitutes a rate of 2.83 mills per kilowatt.

#### PACIFIC NORTHWEST-PACIFIC SOUTHWEST INTERTIE

Last year, in the conference report on the Public Works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964, the conferees on the part of the House agreed to the Senate report language with respect to this intertie. In effect, \$7 million was appropriated for acquisition of lands and for the acquisition and installation of equipment, and \$1,500,000 for preliminary engineering to initiate construction of two extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the Bonneville Power Administration system with the Central Valley project power system. The conferees directed that construction of these lines not begin until there had been enacted into law S. 1007, or similar legislation, guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on the electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region. Senate bill S. 1007 is still deadlocked and presently is in the House Rules Committee awaiting a rule on the appointment on new conferees.

The conference report also required that construction shall not begin unless the Secretary of the Interior finds, after good faith negotiations with utilities and other entities interested in constructing any portion of the lines involved, that their proposals will not result in benefits to the national interest at least equal to those to be derived from Federal construction.

The House committee report on S. 1007 states that the Pacific Northwest presently has, and will continue to have for some time, surplus hydro-electric capacity and energy during some months of the year which could help to meet peakloads in the Pacific Southwest and conserve fuel which would otherwise be used for steam electric generation. Also, in the years to come, offpeak steam generation in the Pacific Southwest could be utilized to firm up the hydro-electric capac-



ity of the Pacific Northwest and convert what would otherwise be secondary power to firm power. In addition, the diversity of loads would permit a large savings in steamplant investment in each region. These benefits, and others, make an interconnection between the power systems of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest highly desirable from the standpoint of both regions.

The most impelling reason that the Pacific Northwest desires early construction of an intertie with the Southwest is their current operating deficit. In this connection, Mr. Luce testified that the Bonneville Power Administration operated at an annual loss of \$5.5 million in fiscal year 1963 compared to a loss of \$17.7 million in fiscal year 1962.

The apparent improvement in their financial position is the result of several actions that the Bonneville Power Administration has taken. That agency, during the past year revised their payout schedule. Previously, they were on a system under which they paid out each dam on a separate 50-year schedule. They have now substituted a system-wide payout schedule whereby they pay out all of the dams within 50 years after the last major addition to the system. (This would mean an amortization period of at least 80 to 100 years for some of the dams.) They also used revised cost allocations which reduced the amount chargeable to power for the Grand Coulee, the Dalles, and McNary Dams. In addition, they increased the amortization period for their transmission lines from 35 to 40 years.

Mr. Luce further testified that the Bonneville Power Administration reviewed their rate schedule and in November of 1963 circulated among their customers a proposed new rate which would have increased the firm power rate about 8½ percent and added some \$6.5 million to their revenue. The Administrator then testified in the House that the customers' reaction to this proposed rate increase was generally one of opposition, and that the Governors and Members of Congress from the Pacific Northwest asked that the rate increase be postponed for another year since so much of their financial future depends upon what happens to the proposed California intertie program. In response to questions from members of the House committee, Mr. Luce testified that even with the increased rates which were proposed, they would still be the lowest cost power producing agency in the Nation.

Another factor affecting the desirability of such an intertie is the imminent exchange of ratifications between the United States and Canada with respect to the Canadian Water Treaty. During the House hearings, Mr. Luce testified that the Canadian Parliament ratified the treaty upon the condition that the United States find a purchaser for Canada's share of the power in the United States for a period of 30 years, and that the purchaser be willing to pay for this power in advance for the full 30-year period. The amount of money involved is \$254,400,000 and, under the terms of the Canadian ratification, that money must be available by October 1, 1964, or the Canadian ratification does not hold. Since there is no intertie, the Bonneville Power Administration must look to the Pacific Northwest for those purchasers. The Pacific Northwest will need this Canadian power beginning about 1973 to 1975; whereas, the Canadian power becomes available in 1968 and it will be surplus to the needs of the Pacific Northwest between 1968 and approximately 1975.

Pursuant to the instructions continued in the conference report last year, negotiations were carried out between representatives of the Department of the Interior and the private power companies. The Department of the Interior provided the private power companies with criteria for their use in the

preparation of written proposals to be submitted to the Department of the Interior by April 17, 1964. No funds for the construction of the intertie were requested in the 1965 budget. It was contemplated that after the proposals of the private power companies were submitted, analyzed, and such further negotiations as seemed necessary concluded, the Secretary would submit a report to the Congress for its review of his recommended intertie system.

During the House hearings on the 1965 bill, Mr. Luce testified that in the event that the recommendations were to include the construction of lines in the Bonneville marketing area by the Bonneville Power Administration, they would require about \$31,700,000 in fiscal year 1965 (present estimate is \$42 million). Of this amount, he stated that \$13,100,000 would be for a 500,000-volt alternating-current line and \$18,600,000 for a direct-current line extending from the Dalles Dam to the Nevada-California line. It could be assumed, therefore, that promptly upon submission of a report recommending the construction of any Federal lines, there would be a supplemental estimate to cover the cost of this work submitted by the President.

On June 24, Secretary Udall submitted his report to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. That report proposes that four extra high voltage transmission lines be constructed by a combination of Federal, public, and private entities at a total cost of about \$700 million, of which about 40 percent would be Federal. Immediately following the submission of that report, public hearings were scheduled for July 1 and 2 at the urgent request of Governor Brown and at the suggestion of President Johnson.

At those hearings, the administration witnesses in support of the proposal testified that the effect of the interchange plan on the power system of the Pacific Northwest will be to provide the equivalent of a net increase of 700,000 kilowatts of firm power. However, even with all of the advantages of this interconnection of the hydroelectric projects in the Northwest into the big steamplants in the Southwest, Mr. Luce told the Senate committee there will come a time in the mid-1970's when even with all the dams developed, the utilities in the Northwest, public and private, are going to have to add steamplants.

In discussing the urgency for the initiation of these interconnections, BPA testified that if there is a delay in construction of these lines, there will be a substantial increase in the Bonneville rate next year. The public power customers of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Valley project will have to have nearly one-half of their powerload withdrawn at an early date when the Bureau of Reclamation will require substantial blocks of power for pumping in connection with the San Luis project.

The proposed plan will permit all of Canada's share of treaty power to be marketed in California during the early years when it is surplus to the Northwest's needs. It thus will help the United States meet its obligations under the treaty to purchase on a prepaid basis Canada's share of treaty power. Of the total transmission capacity of 4,400,000 kilowatts, about 60 percent thereof would be assured for preference customers in the Pacific Southwest under Federal law. These customers would have direct access to Northwest and Canadian power and complete use of this transmission capacity to make advantageous exchanges with Northwest public and private utilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the second objection I have to the bill relates to the TVA. All of us are in favor of TVA. It is a good institution. I was happy to assist all I could in developing

that great Authority. All of us know that the TVA has done a wonderful job in Tennessee, Kentucky, and in fact in the whole area where it is located. I personally voted for the construction of the necessary steamplants in order to firm the electricity that was produced from falling water. But, after that point was reached, I voted against any further authorization of moneys in order to build steamplants in that area.

Today, I am unhappy to say that more than 73 percent of all the electricity that is produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority comes from steam, and not falling water. There is a reason for that. The Atomic Energy Commission took a good deal of that power. At the time this burden was placed on the TVA, I thought it would be wise that the atomic energy plant should construct this facility. But no attention was paid to that suggestion. We proceeded to spend a great deal of tax money in order to construct a number of steamplants that are now being operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of course, all of that is water under the bridge. There is nothing that we can do about it.

The TVA is now trying to enter into a new sphere. Under the law, as I understand it, the TVA has the authority to provide for studies in reforestation, studies as to the best use of fertilizer, and things of that kind. It has authority to make plans useful to the Congress and the States for the development of the TVA area, and to conduct demonstrations necessary and suitable to the making of such plans. The law provides for submission to Congress of such legislation as may be necessary to carry out such plans.

We have provided in the bill approximately \$50 million for the purposes of this agency. But the TVA proposes to use part of these funds in embarking on a new program that involves the purchase of land for the purpose of developing a national recreation area. In my opinion the TVA today owns more land than is necessary for it to carry on the projects that it is authorized under the law to carry on. In spite of this, the TVA plans to use \$5 million of the funds provided by this bill to add to the \$4 million that was used by it last year to purchase land for the proposed recreation area. They propose to purchase more than 100,000 acres for this purpose, and, in addition, to acquire additional land from other Government agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has once again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out in the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, as I read the law, and as the attorney for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry indicated to me in an opinion which I will ask to have placed



in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, it would appear that the TVA is going beyond its authority in purchasing land for recreation.

The TVA has under its control around 80,000 acres of land in this area that it can devote for experimental purposes, if it so desires. But what I have objected to, and what I am objecting to now is for the TVA to proceed to buy 100,000 acres and develop that into a park.

It seems to me that if a park is necessary, the project should be turned over to the Park Service. The land purchases and the development should be made by the Park Service instead of the TVA. I have seen no suggestion anywhere that the TVA knows more about park management than does the Park Service, and can "demonstrate" to the Park Service how to run a park. The park is not a demonstration necessary and suitable to any plans TVA is making, but is the end product of plans completed by TVA in 1961.

The TVA authorities have appeared before us. They take the position that this 100,000 acres, can be purchased for \$12 million, that is \$120 an acre in round figures. I have evidence to show that in the area where it is desired to buy, some of that land has sold for as much as \$1,600 an acre. I do not believe that this land can be purchased by the TVA for anything like \$120 an acre.

As I said, we have already appropriated \$4 million. There is \$5 million in the bill, which will make a total of \$9 million. Under the program we shall need to appropriate only \$3 million more to buy all of the 100,000 acres. But if we continue the program, I venture to say that it will not cost \$12 million, but will cost \$20 million or perhaps \$25 million.

It is my hope that when this subject comes before the Senate next year, we shall look into it further; and if a park is necessary in that area, that the proper authority in the Government will be directed to handle it, rather than permitting the TVA to embark on a program that it was not authorized to undertake under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain data that I have gathered with respect to this subject. Included in this material are statements concerning the methods used by TVA to acquire private property for this questionable project. I do not know that the people making these statements would have any objection to having their names appear in them. However, I have taken the liberty of deleting their names and identifying information.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR ELLENDER

This responds to your request for our views on the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop the Land Between the Lakes Recreation Area.

#### I. CONCLUSIONS

There would appear to be a substantial question as to whether such development is authorized. The question is a factual one.

If the development is, in fact, simply a study, experiment, or demonstration "necessary and suitable" to the making of plans useful to Congress and the several States under section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, it would appear to be authorized by that section. If however, the recreation area is, in fact, an end objective in itself, not related to the making of plans useful to Congress or the States, or not "necessary and suitable" to the making of such plans, it would not appear to be authorized.

#### II. THE LAW

Section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, 16 U.S.C. 831u, authorizes the President to make surveys and plans useful to Congress and the several States in guiding and controlling development of the TVA area for the purpose of fostering its physical, economic, and social development. Section 23 directs the President, as such surveys and plans progress, to recommend to Congress such legislation as he deems proper to carry out the general purposes of section 22. Section 22 therefore provides for the development of plans, while section 23 requires the submission of legislation to carry them out.

Section 22 further authorizes the President in making plans, to cooperate with States and other agencies, and to make necessary studies, experiments, or demonstrations, as follows: "and the President is further authorized in making said surveys and plans to cooperate with the States affected thereby, [or subdivisions or agencies of such States, or with cooperative or other organizations, and to make such studies, experiments, or demonstrations as may be necessary and suitable to that end.]"

The language in black brackets was added by an amendment offered by Senator Norris, who was managing the bill. It had not been considered by the committee, but was one of a number of amendments suggested by Dr. Morgan, the president of Antioch College. Senator Norris explained the amendment as follows:

"This amendment, which he suggested, appeals to me, and I think it would to anyone who would read the text, as being necessary." (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2634.)

The amendment was therefore regarded by its sponsor as being simply a necessary technical amendment. It authorized cooperation with additional agencies in the making of plans, and it authorized such studies, experiments and demonstrations as were necessary in the making of such plans. It certainly was not regarded as a major change which would authorize the carrying out of plans made under section 22 without the necessity of submitting legislation as required by section 23.

While the 1965 budget (Appendix p. 878) and the Senate hearings on H.R. 11579, this Congress, describe the land between the lakes development as "demonstration," and the TVA in a letter of July 18, 1963 to Senator MORRIS cited section 22 as the basic authorization for this "demonstration in resource development", we question whether it is not a "demonstration in resource development" in the same manner that the entire TVA system might be described as an experiment or "demonstration in resource development." We do not believe that the Norris amendment was intended to authorize extensive developments of this nature.

The budget describes the area to be covered as approximately 170,000 acres, offering the innumerable recreational advantages associated with 300 miles of cove-studded shoreline, and being within sunrise-to-sunset driving of 50 million people. The budget describes it further as a wise use of land which will serve as a stimulus to the economy of the surrounding area by encouraging further private development and as a guide to

possible public development of other areas for recreation in the Tennessee Valley region and the Nation. Planned recreation facilities include campgrounds, picnic areas, boat launching ramps, associated roads and parking sites, and areas for hiking, fishing, and game management. The preliminary estimate for total capital outlays is \$33 million. The hearings (p. 11) indicate that the project contemplates purchase of 103,000 acres. Neither the budget nor the hearings mention the surveys or plans being made by the President to which the proposed "demonstration" is "necessary and suitable". Rather, the proposed "demonstration" is related to the rather general purposes of fostering "a better understanding on the part of our people and of coming generations of their dependence on the land", the project being one "of national importance and national scope." (Hearings p. 7.)

Section 22, in its entirety, reads as follows:

"To aid further the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and of such adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this chapter, and to provide for the general welfare of the citizens of said areas, the President is authorized, by such means or methods as he may deem proper within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress, to make such surveys of and general plans for said Tennessee basin and adjoining territory as may be useful to the Congress and to the several States in guiding and controlling the extent, sequence, and nature of development that may be equitably and economically advanced through the expenditure of public funds, or through the guidance or control of public authority, all for the general purpose of fostering an orderly and proper physical, economic, and social development of said areas; and the President is further authorized in making said surveys and plans to cooperate with the States affected thereby, or subdivisions or agencies of such States, or with cooperative or other organizations, and to make such studies, experiments, or demonstrations as may be necessary and suitable to that end."

Respectively,

HARKER T. STANTON,  
Counsel, Senate Committee  
on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### LAND BETWEEN THE LAKES PROJECT (TVA)

1. About 1959 TVA Board authorized a study under section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Administration Act as to the recreation possibilities of the Land Between the Lakes area. Other agencies were consulted and some of them, such as the Park Service, made independent surveys. However, TVA advises that TVA originated the proposal.

2. On June 23, 1961, TVA submitted a report to the President proposing that the "Between the Lakes National Recreation Area" be established as a national recreation area in support of the country's present and future needs for outdoor recreation properties. (Letter of transmittal.) The report stated that "We have undertaken sufficient study of the possibilities for a national recreation area at this location to be convinced of its feasibility. We think the establishment of a national recreation area between the lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers is a most worthwhile proposal" (p. 4). Endorsements of the proposal by the Governors of Kentucky and Tennessee were included as part of the report. No suggestion was made that any "studies, experiments, or demonstrations" were necessary or should be made. The only thing that appeared to be lacking was the authority to carry out the proposal, the report



stating at page 3, "The project, if authorized at an early date as we propose, would provide economic stimulus to the area." TVA regarded its survey as complete, and concluded on page 4, "We will be glad to cooperate in any way we may in furtherance of the project."

3. On July 5, 1961, the President advised the TVA that he had received its proposal "for a national recreation area," and that he was referring it to the Secretary of the Interior for examination "in the light of the recreational needs of the Nation and particularly the Kentucky Lake and Barkley Reservoir area." No suggestion was made that any "demonstration" was involved or would be undertaken.

4. On March 25, 1963, the Secretary of the Interior wrote to the President suggesting that TVA carry out the recreation project as a demonstration under section 22, saying, "The major question that required resolution in our consideration of the proposal was to determine how best to meld the objective of the wildlife refuge into the broader objective of an enlarged area with emphasis on outdoor recreation. As a result of a recent discussion with Mr. A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the TVA Board, we believe we now have a solution which will permit an early start on the proposal.

"TVA would develop the area as a demonstration. It has authority to set up and conduct demonstration projects in resource development and to acquire lands needed for such projects.

"I therefore propose that if you will direct TVA to proceed with the project, we will enter into an agreement with TVA, whereby the land and facilities presently under the jurisdiction of this Department will be placed under the complete direction of TVA.

"As envisioned by TVA, the project will demonstrate how an area with limited timber, agricultural, and industrial resources can be converted into a recreation asset that will stimulate economic growth of the region. It will help establish and define guidelines for the acquisition, development and operation of other outdoor recreation areas. TVA will administer the area for the period required to complete the demonstration. This is estimated to be about ten year. At the end of the demonstration period, permanent administration of the area for outdoor recreation will be determined."

5. On June 14, 1963, the President announced that TVA would have the mission of developing the Land Between the Lakes national recreation area as a demonstration in resource development."

6. On June 19, 1963, the President sent down a supplemental budget request including an increase for TVA described as follows: "This amendment is to provide funds for the initiation of work, including land acquisition, for the Land Between the Lakes, a national recreation area in western Kentucky and Tennessee."

7. On November 19, 1963, A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the TVA Board, testified at the public works appropriation hearings: "TVA intends to develop this area primarily for inexpensive camping by families and groups such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, boys clubs, and other groups who find occasion to seek outdoor recreation.

"In summary, we would develop Land Between the Lakes as a trial and a demonstration to find the most useful kind of a recreational development to fill the needs of our people during an industrial age.

"We would, in short, hope to develop multiple uses of the area." (The development of multiple use has, of course, been an objective of the national forest since they were created, so there as been a good deal of "demonstration" in this area in the past.)

8. The Senate committee report (88th Cong., S. Rept. 746) on the public works appropriation bill provided TVA with its full budget request, without comment on the Land of Lakes project. The conferees agreed on an intermediate amount without comment on this project. (H. Rept. No. 1027.)

9. A TVA 1964 concept statement, and the 1964 testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works emphasizes that the project is a demonstration in resource development. However, it appears to be a simple and complete carrying out of the 1961 TVA report, which did not mention the word "demonstration." The matters to be "demonstrated" would appear to be basically the same as those "demonstrated" by the national forests, national parks, and other recreation areas. They do not appear to involve any demonstration necessary to the making of any plans under section 22, but to be a carrying out of a completed plan under section 22. The TVA statement in the U.S. Government Manual states that sections 22 and 23 of the act confer upon the Corporation "the authority to conduct investigations upon which additional legislation may be predicated in order to aid further the proper conservation, development, and use of the resources of the region." In this case the Corporation would appear to be attempting to avoid the necessity of further legislation by describing the project as a "demonstration."

10. The concept statement (page (i)) describes the Land Between the Lakes Area as "unique" because of its size, variety of recreational opportunities, and its proposed single ownership by TVA. Its most precious asset is described at page 3 as its 300 miles of shoreline on an area about 40 miles long and 6 to 12 miles wide. This would seem to be sufficiently unusual to make development of the area as a "demonstration" of questionable value to other areas not having this advantage.

I, \_\_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_, Trigg County, Ky., on or about the date of March 10, 1964 was approached by a representative of the Tennessee Valley Authority; namely, Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, field representative for the Land Between the Lakes Project and was told by him that I might be jeopardizing my position as postmaster of \_\_\_\_\_, if I refused to cooperate with TVA in the matter of their land acquisition program plans for the Land Between the Lakes Project.

Postmaster, \_\_\_\_\_, Ky.

AUGUST 3, 1964.

Witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_.

AUGUST 3, 1964.

AUGUST 3, 1964.

My name is \_\_\_\_\_. I live \* \* \* approximately 2 miles east of Golden Pond Ky. During late February and March 1964, a surveyor for the Tennessee Valley Authority came on my property five times to measure it. The first time he drove up in front of my house and talked to me in my front-yard. He asked me where the corners of my property were, and I told him. He made notations on a map he was carrying, but did not actually go to each corner and look at it. When he had finished the notations, he left. A few days later, the same man knocked at my back door and I invited him into my house. He asked me about the location of a corner on a piece of property about 500 feet from my house. I told him where I thought the corner was—even though the property in question did not belong to me—and at the same time I told him that as far as my property was concerned, I had nothing I wanted to sell. Both of these meetings with this man were friendly and cordial.

Then, a few days later, the same surveyor returned with a helper and began to measure the front-line of my property. I told him to tell his foreman to come and talk to me before he sent anyone to survey my property, and he said he would do that, and he got in his car and left. The next day I had to leave my house for awhile. When I returned, the same surveyor had his transit set up in the same place it had been the day before, and his helper was taking a tape measure across the front-line of my property. When they saw my car coming, they got into their car and drove off. Several days later, the same man and his helper returned for the third time to measure the front-line of my property. It was raining at the time, and when I saw them I went out into my yard. The rain began to fall heavier at that time, and the two men got into their car and drove away. A few minutes later I got in my car and drove down the road a short distance to where the two men were parked. I told the surveyor he had tried three times to measure my land, even though I had told him repeatedly not to do it. He told me he would never set foot on my land again, and as far as I know, he has not. During the five times I talked to this surveyor, he did not tell me his name and would tell me only that he was from the TVA.

I swear that the above statement is true and accurate as it is written.

Witnesses: \_\_\_\_\_.

AUGUST 3, 1964.

My name is \_\_\_\_\_. I live with my husband, \_\_\_\_\_, on a \_\_\_\_\_ acre homesite on U.S. Highway 68. On or about February 25, 1964, three men knocked at the door of our home. They did not tell me their names, but said that they represented the Tennessee Valley Authority and had come to "run the lines, measure the buildings and get the property ready for appraisal." I told them that I did not tend to the business of my family, and said that I could call my husband and have him there in 10 minutes. One of the men replied, "We do not need or want your husband. We have been sent here to proceed, and we will proceed." I repeated several times that I could not help them without my husband, and each time the same man repeated that he did not need or want my husband, and would proceed without him, whether I wanted them to or not. The man then said, "We will now start measuring your house." When I told him I would not allow that, he told me he would return with a U.S. marshal to enforce his orders to measure our property. At about that time, my husband drove up and came into the house. The TVA spokesman asked my husband if he would allow them to measure the property, and my husband replied that he had nothing to sell and would not permit them to proceed. The three TVA men turned to leave, and before they drove off the property their spokesman asked my husband two more times if he would allow them to measure the property. My husband refused both times. The TVA man then told my husband, as he had told me, that he would return with a U.S. marshal to force us to let them survey the property. My husband told them to bring the marshal anytime they were ready, and we would still be here. They then drove off the property, and have not contacted us in any manner whatsoever since that time. On the following day, February 26, we wrote to Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER—on the advice of \_\_\_\_\_ of Cadiz, Ky.—and related to him the incident described above. Senator COOPER acknowledged our letter on March 2, 1964.



I swear that the above incident is true as it is related in this statement.

I swear that the above incident is true as it is related in this statement.

Witnesses:

Affidavit of \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF KENTUCKY,  
COUNTY OF MARSHALL, SCT.

The affiant, \_\_\_\_\_, being duly sworn, states that he and his partner, \_\_\_\_\_, are the owners of a subdivision \_\_\_\_\_ on Barkley Lake just south of the canal, 20 of which are beautiful deep-water front lots and 40 have a nice view of the lake, a reasonable value of the total over a 10-year period being a quarter of a million dollars, and yet the TVA is offering only \$42,000 for property that cost \$35,000, to say nothing of the work and time we have devoted to it. And not considered in the price is more than 600 feet of good commercial highway property. They have, with the offer of \$42,000 set an average price of \$389 per lot, when the very minimum of the water-front lots at present prices is \$3,000 and a low value of the other lots is \$1,000 each. We feel that, if they are to buy our property, that we should have at least today's market price of land in that area, and we realize that they will resell these beautiful tracts for a great profit later on.

In our opinion many people in the area have been shamefully mistreated, and where they have paid higher prices it has been to those whom they felt it was to their advantage to do so. Under all the circumstances, we had certainly rather see any other organization have the management and development of the Recreational Area than the TVA.

This August 3, 1964.

Subscribed and sworn to before me by \_\_\_\_\_ this August 3, 1964. My commission as a notary public expires May 18, 1968.

Notary Public, Livingston County, Ky.

Re Land Between the Lakes Area.

HON. EDWARD T. BREATHITT,  
Governor of Kentucky,  
Frankfort, Ky.

DEAR GOVERNOR BREATHITT: In response to your promise to look into the matter of fairness of price paid owners for land in above area, we feel that we are not being treated fairly, either in price or consideration of our claim.

In 1959 we purchased 11½ acres facing Barkley Dam and Canal, when it would be built, with four beautiful deepwater bays, and at that time we were assured by the U.S. Engineers, who had already put up their markings, that this land would not be taken for any purpose. This is the most desirable and most beautiful tract on the lake and in which we have an investment of more than \$10,000, and for which we could have gotten \$40,000 in July 1963, the day before the announcement that the development of the park had been turned over by President Kennedy to the TVA, which fact had not been heard of until that announcement.

Of course no one would have bought it then, had we wished to sell it. We were aware of the policies of the TVA and were as courteous and cooperative with them as possible, but until the lake was flooded and Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ could come back here and develop this land and build a home for himself and

his family (this was his home base and he had lived here several years and has other property here and wished to return here and make it his permanent home) he was continuing his work with his company at various places, and at the time the TVA looked over the property they were told that he was temporarily in Pennsylvania, but that he would return at any time they wished to talk with him. Incidentally, they are taking other property, which he had owned for sometime in that area.

It is, therefore, our honest and sincere belief that they immediately put us on their blacklist as speculators and cut the price they placed on our land accordingly, although we cannot understand by any stretch of imagination why we did not have as much right back in 1959 to buy this land, looking to the development of the lake and area, especially when we purchased it from a willing seller, as the TVA does now to take it from unwilling sellers and at their own price. If it had been needed for the dam or the lake, or if they did not already have adequate land for all their needs, we would feel entirely differently about the matter.

They have held out all along how fair they are to everyone (the news stories have been full of it) but they would not discuss price with us at all until they brought us a pink copy of the contract prepared by them offering us \$18,000 for our land, which is \$22,000 less than we could have sold it for the day before it was known that they had taken over the area, and yet they are paying another landowner adjoining us more than twice as much as they have offered us for land that is not as valuable as ours, and I say this because I formerly owned half interest in that land, and sold it to purchase the present property we own, knowing that it was more valuable, although they are both, along with another tract we are familiar with, and for which they too are being offered less money, being also considered as speculators because they reside at Madisonville, Ky., the cream of the whole area. I have been active as a real estate broker specializing in Kentucky lake properties for more than 15 years; I know every place around Kentucky and Barkley Lakes for a radius of 250 miles and have sold many thousands of dollars worth of property to people who have done much to develop this whole area; and, furthermore, I have attended every auction sale held by TVA and know the high prices they have gotten for land they purchased for very small prices.

Of course, the TVA will deny that they have discriminated against us, and that they are not offering us a fair price for our subdivision, and they are denying that they will at some future date sell these beautiful tracts of land near Barkley Dam and Canal, but if they do not, they should, since even though they are being taken away from us, and we, as private citizens and taxpayers, are not permitted to keep and develop them, they should be sold for development and the income that it would bring to the adjoining counties, and we know that they will eventually be sold at a fabulous profit to TVA.

Certainly, we are not opposed to the development of the great park as originally planned, nor are we opposed to the purchase by TVA of all the lands they can willingly purchase from present owners, but we do sincerely believe that they have sufficient acreage; and, we do resent the fact that just because the TVA personnel came to the area and viewed these extra beautiful acres, both from land and air, and knowing what profit they could make on them, went in secret to President Kennedy who, for what consideration we will never know, gave it to them. But as long as we are being forced to give it up, we feel that we should at least have a

fair portion of its value and of the price they will eventually realize out of it.

Furthermore, the TVA made their own appraisal of our land and that of our neighbors, and in their own good time, without consultation with us, brought their copies of contracts and said, "This is it—take it or leave it, but if you leave it, we will condemn your land and force you to take it." It seems that our land is no longer a free country where one may ask for a jury trial where the TVA is concerned; they have all the rights and we have absolutely none, except the crumbs they offer us; and, so they sent us written notices that we could not ask for a jury trial, but that if we do not accept their offer they will condemn our land and the only recourse we will have will be before a panel of three men, none of whom we will know, nor be allowed to have any part in selecting.

We asked for a breakdown of their appraisal—the land and the timber—and were told "No, we cannot tell you that—we would be in trouble all around, if we did that." And when I replied that never in my life had I heard of a case where both purchaser and seller could not have a breakdown of appraisal, I was told that they only had to disclose that at the hearing, and not before. I then asked if I could talk with those who had made the appraisal and was told in a very nice manner that I could talk with everybody from Golden Pond to Knoxville and that they would all listen to me, but that there would absolutely be no change in their offer—that they never had, and never would change an offer of purchase, and that we might as well accept it now as later.

The Courier Journal recently criticized Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD for not doing more in favor of TVA and against the property owners. I always thought that those men, like our Governors, were elected by the people and for the people of Kentucky, and that they were our representatives. This was the first time I had heard they were supposed to take sides with the TVA against their own people, who elected them.

Governor Scranton said the TVA belongs to the people and not to any one person, but I wonder if he would not be surprised to know that he is mistaken, and that it is just the other way around—the people belong to, and are controlled, body and soul, by the TVA, and if you don't believe it, I can show you things right here around Kentucky Lake to prove it beyond the shadow of a doubt. We are not fighting the TVA and we deeply appreciate all that has been done by them by and through the taxpayers' money, but we also feel that along with all the power and authority that has been bestowed upon them by our Government, plain, ordinary citizens and taxpayers should have a few rights left to them. And, it is certainly alarming that they can, without even a discussion, set the price on one's property, and then have the power to deny a trial or hearing by a jury. And, it is for that very reason that most of the poor, helpless people in that area have accepted their offers whether they wished to or not—they simply tell you, "Well, there is nothing else we can do about it." And there isn't.

Most sincerely,

BETWEEN THE LAKES RECREATIONAL AREA

Federal holdings: The inventory report on real property owned by the United States as of June 30, 1963, showed that the Federal Government owned 1,077,928 acres in Kentucky out of a total area of 24,434,392 acres, or 4.225 percent. Of the area of the State of



Tennessee, the Federal Government owns 1,554,000 acres out of a total of 25,173,680 acres, or 5.814 percent. Putting it another way, the land owned by the Federal Government in Kentucky and Tennessee totals 2,631,928 acres, which is an area that is only slightly less than four times the size of the entire State of Rhode Island. Tennessee ranks third in the Nation in the cost of federally owned real property, and Kentucky ranks twelfth.

Tennessee Valley Authority holdings: The TVA alone owns land in excess of 697,632.5 acres, of which 441,296.4 acres are located in Tennessee and Kentucky.

Private ownership north of the wildlife refuge: In the area north of the wildlife refuge, that is the area between Golden Pond Road and the canal, there is an area of 13,000 acres in private ownership that is now in the process of being acquired by TVA. Practically all of the opposition to the further development of this area is being generated by the owners of about 4,000 acres in this area. This property has been subdivided into lots and has a relatively high value, whereas the land to be acquired between U.S. Highways 68 and 79, comprising some 85,000 acres, is relatively worthless. The present plans to acquire approximately 103,000 acres to add to their present holdings at a cost of \$12 million results in the local interests arriving at the conclusion that TVA will pay \$120 per acre. It is apparent, therefore, that the figure of \$120 per acre referred to by the opposition is an average cost which the local people have worked out by dividing TVA's estimated cost of land acquisition by the total number of acres to be acquired and does not represent TVA's estimate of the value of this particular land.

Area between the highways: In the area between U.S. Highways 68 and 79 there is approximately 96,000 acres, of which 11,450 acres are now in Federal ownership, broken down as follows: TVA has acquired 3,880 acres along the edge of the Kentucky Reservoir, the Fish and Wildlife Service owns 3,250 acres which is a part of the existing wildlife refuge in Trigg County, and the Corps of Engineers has acquired 4,320 acres in connection with the construction of the Barkey Dam.

Possible private development in adjacent area: Private business concerns are interested in the commercial and industrial development of the area south of the proposed expanded recreational area. They are currently seeking assistance from the Area Redevelopment Administration to help finance their proposal. ARA in turn has requested a preliminary economic evaluation of their proposal by a private engineering firm.

Original concept of the recreational area: It is my understanding that the original concept of the development of this area was formulated in the Department of the Interior and that the execution of the plan was subsequently turned over to the TVA because they would not require any additional legislative authorization.

Other possible developments: The letters from the proponents of this development point out that the proposed recreational area is within a day's driving distance of something near 100 million people. This is similar to the claims being made for the establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania. That legislation and other bills to establish large recreation areas throughout the country are now pending consideration by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is attached a summary of the Federal holdings in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee.

*Summary of Federal lands held by civil agencies as of June 30, 1963*

|                                 |               |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Corps of Engineers.....         | 1 355,199.1   |
| Fish and Wildlife Service.....  | 62,104.9      |
| National Park Service.....      | 311,882.6     |
| Veterans' Administration.....   | 800.1         |
| Public Health Service.....      | 1,041.6       |
| Atomic Energy Commission....    | 3,667.6       |
| Agriculture.....                | 1,058,936.2   |
| Tennessee Valley Authority....  | 441,296.4     |
| Post Office Department.....     | 6.0           |
| <hr/>                           |               |
| Total rural land.....           | 2 2,234,928.5 |
| Total urban land.....           | 42,585.0      |
| <hr/>                           |               |
| Total rural and urban land..... | 2,277,513.5   |
| Total military land.....        | 354,414.5     |
| <hr/>                           |               |
| Total Federal holdings....      | 2,631,928.0   |

<sup>1</sup> A current report from the Corps of Engineers shows that they own 471,392 acres of which 201,735 acres are below the permanent pool and 269,657 acres are above the permanent pool.

<sup>2</sup> The total Federal holdings north of the first road comprise 74,912 acres of which 11,850 are owned by the Corps of Engineers, 58,950 by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and 4,112 by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am among those who deeply appreciate the excellent services of the chairman of the committee. I appreciate also the services of the valuable ranking Republican member, as well as other members of the committee.

I invite the attention of the chairman to a very small item in the bill about which I am deeply concerned. That is the comprehensive survey for the Pascagoula River Basin in Alabama and Mississippi. I have a document from the U.S. Engineers which the Senator has not had an opportunity to see because it was received so recently. The item involves the completion date of surveys for that short river basin, and a small added sum that the House included for the purpose of his slight increase. I know that the Senator will give consideration to the additional facts stated in the document when the bill goes to conference, because the point will be saved for the conference between the House and the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year I discovered that some of the comprehensive surveys had gone up in cost as much as 600 percent. I wrote to the Budget Bureau, as well as to the Corps of Engineers in the hope that they could coordinate the efforts of all of the agencies engaged in these comprehensive surveys in an effort to reduce the cost. The Budget Bureau has given consideration to that request and the cost of these studies have been reduced from \$400 million to

\$88 million. As I remember, the budget estimate for the survey in which the Senator from Mississippi is interested is \$125,000.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct; only that amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. That sum would be appropriated to continue the study on this comprehensive report.

When I made the request of the Department, I was objecting to some very large increases in the cost of the studies that in my opinion went far beyond what was necessary. It is my hope that in conference it can be shown that studies to be made are in keeping with what I am told should be done—that is, the studies should be of projects on which we can get results now, without having to wait 30 years before their construction is justified. Some of the studies envision action to be taken 30 years hence.

I could not see the necessity for spending a great deal of money on surveys when the recommendations would not be acted upon until some 30 years hence. Through my efforts and those of other members of the committee were able to have more comprehensive studies made, so that they would only study in detail projects that would be built in the next 5 or 10 years. I shall be glad to take that into consideration when the subject is brought before the conference.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his assurances. I am confident that the facts will remove the small survey about which I have been speaking from that class of cases in which there has been a huge increase, and that the facts will justify the survey on the basis which the Senator has stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I recommended to the committee that we go back to the budget estimate on the Wabash River survey, which, as I remember, was \$425,000. It had been raised by the House to \$778,000. I recommended that amount to be cut back to the budget estimate because I felt that it was in keeping with the recommendations that were made by the Corps of Engineers, the Budget Bureau, and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. STENNIS. I assure the Senator that the small survey about which I am speaking would involve only a slight increase, and the ultimate cost would not be in excess of what I believe the Senator thinks is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not need to express my very strong appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I have done so previously. I wish the Record to show that in my judgment he renders a magnificent and dedicated service in conducting the necessary long hearings, and in his fair recommendations. I agree with him 100 percent in his opposition to the building of the proposed 200,000-acre so-called park to be a part of the TVA. I see no possible justification for it. It would tie up several hundred miles of the most beautiful lake



front available in that area. So far as I am concerned, I join him wholeheartedly in opposing it. I am sorry that the majority of the committee did not agree with us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield some time to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL. I wholeheartedly agree with all that has been said about the indefatigable work and the many fine contributions of my friend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in presenting the bill, and the work which has characterized his leadership in all the years that he has served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. I also agree with the well-deserved tributes that have been paid to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for his hard work and many fine contributions that he has made in bringing the bill to the Senate.

As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, a majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee did not agree with him with reference to the appropriations for TVA. I am gratified to say that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska did agree with the majority of the subcommittee and with the majority of the full committee as to the appropriation for TVA.

The distinguished Senator from Florida has overestimated the amount of the acreage involved by some 30,000 acres. It is not 200,000 acres; it is 170,000 acres, of which the Federal Government now owns 74,902 acres. It lies in an isthmus created by the construction of the Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee River and the Barkley Dam on the Cumberland River. It is at that point in Kentucky where those two rivers come together and flow into the Ohio. Then, as we know, the Ohio goes down into the Mississippi. The construction of those two dams made those two great lakes, the Kentucky Lake and the Barkley Lake, and the land about which we speak is known as the "Land Between the Lakes." That is the area for which the appropriation has been provided.

The preceding Congress made an appropriation of \$4 million to proceed with the acquisition of land.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement with reference to the TVA and the Land Between the Lakes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TVA AND THE LAND BETWEEN THE LAKES

Development of the Land Between the Lakes is precisely the type of demonstration contemplated by section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Section 22 must be interpreted in the light of the overall purpose of that act—the development in the public interest of all the natural resources in the Tennessee Valley and adjoining and related areas. In his message to the Congress of April 10, 1933, President Roosevelt recommended the creation of a corporation "charged with the broadest duty of planning

for the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and its adjoining territory for the general social and economic welfare of the Nation" and "clothed with the necessary power to carry these plans into effect." Congress accepted this recommendation when it passed the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act does more than delegate to the TVA Board responsibility for carrying out a variety of specific and unrelated programs. The Board's responsibilities under the act are broad and general. They relate to the development of the entire area. In *Welch v. U.S.* (327 U.S. 546, 553) the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1946, speaking for a unanimous Court, described these responsibilities as follows:

"That act does far more than authorize the TVA to build isolated dams. The broad responsibilities placed on the Authority relate to navigability, flood control, reforestation, marginal lands, and agricultural and industrial development of the whole Tennessee Valley.

"All of the Authority's action in these respects were to be directed toward 'development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and of such adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this act \* \* \* all for the general purpose of fostering an orderly and proper physical, economic, and social development of said areas.'"

The language of the Court is from section 22 of the act.

In 1933 some of the steps needed to develop the Tennessee Valley were clear. It was recognized that the river needed to be developed for navigation, that its floods should be controlled, and that steps needed to be taken to control the erosion of the region's soils. Congress specifically directed TVA to generate and transmit electricity, and set forth the policies under which the power was to be marketed. It specifically directed TVA to produce new types of fertilizer and to test and demonstrate their use in actual farming operations. These and other programs were clearly required to meet regional needs and the projects and programs were specifically enumerated in the act. But the Tennessee Valley Authority Act recognized that other problems would be uncovered, that opportunities not then foreseen would be disclosed, that full development of the region's resources would require a wide range of programs. So Congress authorized the President, within the limits of appropriations and without other limitations, to make such surveys and general plans as would be useful to Congress and the several States "in guiding and controlling the extent, sequence, and nature of development that may be equitably and economically advanced through the expenditure of public funds, or through the guidance or control of public authority, all for the general purpose of fostering an orderly and proper physical, economic, and social development of said areas," and adjoining territory make the studies, experiments, and demonstrations necessary and suitable to that end. In June of 1933, by Executive Order 6161, this authority was delegated by the President to the TVA Board.

Land Between the Lakes, a national recreation area, of which the Federal Government now owns 74,902 acres, is now proposed as such a demonstration. Recreation has come to be recognized as one of the important benefits derived from dam and reservoir systems. Under the TVA Act its board had an obligation to recognize the emergence of this new regional asset, to survey the recreation potential of its reservoir system, and to make plans looking toward its maximum contribution to the welfare of the Nation. This it

has done, displaying the "initiative" and the "vision" described in President Roosevelt's message to the Congress in 1933. Recreation demonstrations were conducted on the very first reservoirs constructed by TVA. Those early demonstrations have long since been turned over to the States for operation. They formed the basis for the excellent State park systems which Alabama and Tennessee now enjoy, and for the flourishing complex of private, and public but non-Federal, facilities for recreation along the shores of all TVA reservoirs.

Land Between the Lakes is simply a continuation of this policy. As part of its general survey under section 22 of the recreational opportunities provided by the TVA reservoir system, the TVA Board studied the area now called Land Between the Lakes, and on July 5, 1961, it recommended to the President that this unique area, lying between two great manmade lakes, Kentucky and Barkley, be developed with Federal funds for nationwide benefit. At this point the next step was up to the President. He could have rejected the recommendation or he could have instructed a different agency to seek funds for its achievement. Instead, on June 14, 1963, after first referring the report to the Department of the Interior and after receiving that Department's recommendation that the project be undertaken by TVA, he directed TVA to develop the area as a demonstration in resource development. The Congress expressed its approval by providing the initial appropriation of \$4 million for fiscal year 1964, and TVA began the development. When it is completed we shall see how marginal lands of little value for other purposes, described as a deficit area, a pauperized area can become an economic asset to the region, and how an area not richly endowed with beautiful scenery or impressive monuments of history can be made to serve the need for outdoor recreation of millions of people. We will learn here from a kind of laboratory in multipurpose park development how a game refuge can be operated not separately and apart, but as an impressive feature of a whole recreation resource. In one area and under a single management a variety of opportunities for recreation will be combined. There will be hunting and fishing and water sports. There will be primitive camping areas and areas for families and for groups. The whole development will provide an outdoor classroom in conservation. For TVA contemplates that, in the program of erosion control and reforestation which has already begun, the energies of organized camping groups can be utilized, as educators use portions of the area for classes in natural science. There is no development like this anywhere in the United States. This multipurpose park will provide the information which Congress and the States will need. It will demonstrate the kind of recreation areas needed in the future to serve our urbanized and industrialized society.

It is not proposed that TVA should operate the area indefinitely. As soon as the development is completed, the experiments concluded and a reasonable period of demonstration undertaken it is expected that this project, like earlier demonstrations, will be turned over to another agency for permanent operation. Once more section 22 will have proved its worth. By its initiative and vision TVA again will have served the public welfare.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I join with my colleagues in expressing great appreciation and thanks to the



entire staff and all Senators concerned with the bill. I am on the Public Works Committee, and I know something about the vast amount of work that goes into the bill before it reaches the Senate. The chairman of the subcommittee has rendered distinguished service, as have all other members of the committee and the staff.

North Carolina has a number of important projects which are included in the bill, for which we are very grateful.

I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the Senator from Washington that these are not pork-barrel projects, but projects to save our country from a great deal of destruction, particularly as regards the coast lines. Such projects are provided for in the bill. The coastlines are being eroded. Without the help of our Federal Government, our coastlines would be continually destroyed, and would continue to move inland.

I am deeply appreciative, and I know I speak for all the people of North Carolina when I say I am grateful for the fine work done for North Carolina.

#### FLOODING OF SENECA RESERVATION, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 2 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill contains \$27 million for the Allegheny River project—the Kinzua Dam construction. For years, in my service both in the House and in the Senate, I have opposed the construction of this dam on a site which would result in the flooding of the Seneca Indian reservation in Salamanca, N.Y.

Those of us who opposed the construction of the dam on this site lost our battle, the dam was built and is, in fact, due to be completed on October 1. What is really shocking, however, is that the hundreds of Seneca Indians who will be forced to leave their homes on that date have not yet received a single cent of compensation for the land taken by the Federal Government. They have not been able to make any plans for moving, they have been unable to borrow money with which to build new homes—and this injustice is in addition to the fact that their treaty with the U.S. Government, which dates back to 1794, was violated when the dam was built.

Mr. President, the Senecas are the innocent victims of congressional inaction. Although both Houses have passed the compensation bill, the figures differed widely. The conferees have not met in almost 6 weeks, and an agreement on the bill does not appear imminent. I could not, in good conscience, vote for additional appropriations for this project—appropriations far in excess of the Seneca compensation money, I might add—without adding a plea to the conferees on H.R. 1794 to get together and agree upon a compensation bill without delay.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague and I have joined in sponsoring

a bill (S. 1836) seeking justice for the Indians at the Kinzua Dam site. October approaches very rapidly, and, as my colleague has said so eloquently, the Indians have no place to go, and no financial provision has been made for them.

I bespeak the deep humanitarian interest of my colleague [Mr. KEATING], and others of my colleagues, I am sure. I believe that the difference between the Senate and the House is relatively modest. Both Houses can get together on it without either sacrificing principle. The need is great and most urgent. President Heron, of the Seneca Nation of Indians, has been down to see both Senators.

I urge my Senate colleagues to walk the extra half mile with our House colleagues so that the matter may be adjusted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, since I am one of the conferees in that matter, I thought I ought to report briefly and tell the Senate that there is money on file in the court cases to provide for relocation. So the problems which the conferees have as between themselves with regard to the relocation funds does not affect the Senecas' right to be relocated with the money that is on hand.

I hope that agreement will be reached very soon. I think we will get together. I know that the Senator from Idaho is working hard on the problem.

Mr. JAVITS. We have real faith that they will reach an agreement, but the problem is that is that the Indians are finding it difficult to find any place in the contiguous towns. What is inherent in the bill is the economic basis for the formulation of plans for relocation of the Seneca Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky have 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman has made a statement about the proposed Between-the-Lakes area. Since part of it lies in the State of Kentucky, I feel that I should make a brief statement about it.

I shall ask that there be placed in the RECORD a copy of the letter dated March 25, 1963, directed to the then President of the United States, Mr. John F. Kennedy, from the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall.

On two occasions, I mentioned before the Committee on Appropriations the facts given in this letter, but I did not have a copy of this letter when I spoke to the Committee on Appropriations. The letter details the negotiations that went on between the Department of the Interior and the TVA over a period of 2 years.

Finally, after 2 years' negotiations, as this letter shows, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, asked the President of the United States to direct TVA to proceed with the development of this area, of course subject to the appropriations of the Congress.

So that the letter may be a part of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1963.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This refers to your letter of July 5, 1961, to the Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, acknowledging receipt of a proposal for a national recreation area between the lakes formed by the Kentucky and Barkley Dams, and indicating that you would request this Department to review the proposal and report more fully thereon. We have examined the area and discussed the proposal fully with officials of the TVA.

The area unquestionably has outstanding outdoor recreation potentiality and is within 200 miles of nearly 10 million people. It lies between two great rivers—the Tennessee and the Cumberland. On the Tennessee, TVA's Kentucky Dam creates one of the largest manmade reservoirs in the United States. Just across the divide on the Cumberland River the Army Corps of Engineers is building the Barkley Dam which will create a second major lake in the fall of 1964. For a distance of some 40 miles above each dam the shorelines of the two lakes will be only 6 to 12 miles apart. They will enclose a narrow strip of wooded ridges rising 500 feet or so above the broad stretches of reservoir on either side. The area proposed to be set aside for public recreation contains roughly 170,000 acres, two-thirds of it in Kentucky and one-third in Tennessee. I am positive that the area, once developed, will prove to be one of the outstanding outdoor recreation areas of the Nation.

Nearly half of the area under consideration is in Federal ownership, of which approximately 60,000 acres are within the Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge. The refuge serves as wintering grounds for waterfowl, and habitat for wild turkey, deer, and other upland game species. Much of the waterfowl habitat will be inundated by Barkley Reservoir and a substitute area is being acquired upstream, outside the limits of the proposal.

The major question that required resolution in our consideration of the proposal was to determine how best to meld the objectives of the wildlife refuge into the broader objectives of an enlarged area with emphasis on outdoor recreation. As a result of a recent discussion with Mr. A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the TVA Board, we believe we now have a solution which will permit an early start on the proposal.

TVA would develop the area as a demonstration. It has authority to set up and conduct demonstration projects in resource development and to acquire lands needed for such projects.

I therefore propose that, if you will direct TVA to proceed with the project, we will enter into an agreement with TVA, whereby the land and facilities presently under the jurisdiction of this Department will be placed under the complete direction of TVA. I understand that TVA has discussed with the Corps of Engineers the transfer of other lands acquired by the corps within the project area for the Barkley Reservoir. No formal



transfer of lands will be made until funds for initiating the project are assured.

TVA has indicated that the demonstration area will include provisions for development of additional wintering grounds for waterfowl and for management of upland game, including improvement of public hunting. TVA will cooperate with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on these phases of the demonstration.

The Department and TVA believe that public recreation is the best possible use of the area's resources. As envisioned by TVA, the project will demonstrate how an area with limited timber, agricultural, and industrial resources can be converted into a recreation asset that will stimulate economic growth of the region. It will help establish and define guidelines for the acquisition, development, and operation of other outdoor recreation areas. TVA will administer the area for the period required to complete the demonstration. This is estimated to be about 10 years. At the end of the demonstration period, permanent administration of the area for outdoor recreation will be determined.

We have reviewed the general concepts of this proposal with the Governors of Tennessee and Kentucky and with the four Senators and two Congressmen directly concerned.

For your consideration I enclose a proposed press announcement and a proposed letter to Chairman Wagner.

Respectfully yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,  
*Secretary of the Interior.*

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate all that has been said about me and my good friend from Nebraska, but we must not overlook the staff, particularly Ken Bousquet, who sits to my left. Without him and others on the staff, the committee would not be able to do the work it must do. I wish to pay tribute to this youngster. He has been a great help. I am sure my friend from Nebraska will certify to that.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if I may have one-half a minute, I want to acknowledge what the chairman of the subcommittee has said and multiply the tribute, particularly to Mr. Bousquet on the majority side and Ed King on the minority side.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the fiscal year 1965 public works appropriation bill now before us provides nearly \$2 million for Alaska public works and reclamation projects. I support the bill, because the funds it appropriates will be of great value to Alaska, and will repay many times the initial investment by the Federal Government.

House bill 11579 contains the items requested in the President's budget for Alaska. The House of Representatives added \$15,000 to start a general investigation of the Kodiak Harbor. The Senate has retained that item.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has restored to the bill the sum of \$75,000 to be used for the Nenana River flood-control investigation. The total cost of this project will be \$370,000. The House had removed the requested amount to start the project, because of an agreement between the Secretary of the Army

and the Secretary of the Interior; but the Senate Committee in its report expresses the opinion that nothing in the agreement between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior precludes the Corps of Engineers from undertaking specific studies that it was directed to make by a competent committee of the Congress. The committee report further states its belief that the agreement merely assigns to the Department of the Interior the responsibility of assuming leadership for comprehensive studies.

I believe this observation on the part of the Committee is appropriate. The Nenana River flood-control investigation must not be delayed needlessly.

The public works appropriations bill we are debating includes funds for general navigation investigations at Dry Strait, Gastineau Channel, Hydaburg Harbor, King Cove Harbor, Knik and Turnagain Arm causeways, Kodiak Harbor, and Sergius Narrows.

The bill provides an appropriation of \$750,000 for continuation of preconstruction planning of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, authorized by Public Law 874 of the 87th Congress. The Snettisham hydroelectric project, situated 38 miles south of Juneau, will, when completed, provide needed power to help develop Alaska's growing southeast. The Corps of Engineers reports that average annual benefits will exceed annual costs in the ratio of 2.94 to 1, for a 100-year period of analysis; and in the ratio of 2.18, for a 50-year analysis. The total estimated cost of this project is \$44,300,000.

I shall not comment specifically on every Alaskan item in the budget. The bill does not provide funds for Bureau of Reclamation general investigations of the proposed Wood Canyon Dam, on the Copper River, in Alaska. This undesirable project is opposed by the people of the area; and all who are familiar with the beauties of the Copper River are well aware of the fact that the dam is unnecessary.

The bill also appropriates approximately \$452,000 to be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate Alaskan projects. I hope the Senate will act favorably on these items, as well as on those in the bill which would be used for a flood-control project on Ketchikan Creek, and for operation and maintenance purposes at Dillingham Harbor, Name Harbor, and Stikine River.

Next year, when the Senate considers this appropriation bill, I am hopeful that it will include a budgeted item for the preconstruction planning phase of the Rampart Dam project, in central Alaska. No request was made for such funds this year, because the review of the project is now being completed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. SALINGER. Mr. President, I have been a consistent supporter of the 160-acre limitation; and I would not want my vote against the amendment by Senator NELSON to be construed as a reversal of my opposition to unjust enrichment of large landowners, through Federal water projects.

I am supporting the position of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], because I am not persuaded that the contract with the Westlands Water District is in violation of the 160-acre limitation. But even if it were, full recourse to the courts is still available to the contesting parties.

Furthermore, I do not approve of this method of amending the appropriations bill, to achieve a result remote from the purposes of the bill itself. The San Luis project has the prior authorization of Congress. It has the support of the legislature and administration of my State; and it is, without question, a project of vast and urgent importance, not only to the Central Valley of California, but also to the huge agricultural and urban areas to the south.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the public works appropriations bill now before the Senate contains a recommendation, as approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the amount of \$26,000 to reimburse the city of Malta, Mont.

Recently it was brought to the attention of my colleague, Senator METCALF and myself that the city of Malta had undertaken a street improvement project which benefited a number of landholders, including the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation. The city was, according to our information, encouraged by both agencies to include their property in the improvement area. The city now seeks to recover the costs of these improvements. Both Senator METCALF and I feel that this request is entirely justified and that the Federal Government should contribute its share of these improvement costs.

After investigating this situation we find that there is no authorization or suitable provision for such reimbursement. We realize that this situation has developed on a number of other occasions in many other States. This is a situation which should now be considered and I hope that the Senate will agree that the reimbursement to the city of Malta might be favorably considered as a test case and set down a precedent for future action and general legislation.

I recognize that the Federal Government is not liable for property taxes in the individual States. Many of our Federal agencies contribute a great deal to local communities through employment and general economic development. This, I am certain, each of the individual communities appreciate.

I do believe, however, that when these Federal agencies benefit from local improvement projects they should contribute their share as an active participant in the local community.

Mr. President, I do hope and I urge that the Senate will agree to the appropriation of this \$26,000 as a fair contribution to the improvement of one of Montana's growing communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed.



Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT OF 1964— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1057) to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 6, 1964, pp. 17740-17741.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, exactly a year and a day ago the Senate passed S. 1057, the Criminal Justice Act. It was the fourth consecutive Congress in which the Senate had considered and approved a measure which afforded more adequate representation of indigent defendants in our Federal courts than circumstances now allow.

The legislation has had an even longer history. Similar proposals have been introduced and studied for more than a quarter of a century. Each Attorney General since Homer Cummings has urged such action. The Judicial Conference of the United States has similarly labored for the enactment of a bill out of a fundamental concern that the mandate of the sixth amendment be faithfully observed. The bar, the law schools, the professional societies, and other organizations have likewise advocated the adoption of the legislation.

Looking back over this extensive history of the bill and observing the unanimity of support for its adoption, it is with deep gratification that the moment has arrived when the proposal shall become public law. It is even more deep-

ly gratifying that due to the dedicated effort of so many responsible individuals and organizations, working in close cooperation these past several months, the measure before us provides such an excellent realization of a common, indeed universal, objective.

The sixth amendment assures the right to assistance of counsel in criminal cases. Whatever its antecedents, the language now protects anyone standing before the bar of criminal justice from proceeding without the appointment of counsel, when requested and not able to be retained because of insufficient means. It will not surprise this body that an enormous number of individuals accused of crime find themselves in this position. Nearly 10,000 persons, more than 30 percent of the total number of defendants in Federal criminal cases, annually require court-appointed attorneys because they are financially unable to retain their own.

The bar has responded to this obligation conscientiously even while it has been increasingly felt that this procedure does not accomplish the full intent of the constitutional provision. The court-appointed lawyer must serve without compensation. There are simply no means to reimburse him for his expenses necessarily incurred in the preparation of a defense. Customarily, he is not appointed until long after the arrest. Inevitably, those appointed are often without trial experience or sometimes without some familiarity with criminal procedures. This combination of circumstances has led from an uneasy opinion to a growing conviction that legislation is necessary to insure an adequate defense of indigents accused of Federal crimes and, thereby, to discharge the basic obligation that justice shall not be rationed.

By the adoption of the conference report on S. 1057, a major step will be taken in that direction. This bill provides for the appointment of counsel, either from the bar directly or as furnished by bar associations or legal aid agencies, as each district court shall decide, at the earliest stage of the proceeding who shall continue to serve through each successive stage of appeal. The requirement that the U.S. Commissioner advise the accused of his right to counsel and, furthermore, furnish one for him should he appearing without an attorney because of insufficient funds will overcome some of the serious difficulties now encountered by the appointment much later in the proceeding.

The provision for compensation of counsel, while modest, will nevertheless avoid the necessity of further imposing on the bar to assume the obligation of society. The limits specified per hour and per case are set with the normal demands of representation in mind. The bill wisely recognizes that there will be situations where these amounts fall far short of reasonable compensation. Language was therefore included to allow payment in excess of the limits stated if such payment is appropriate to provide fair compensation for such extended representation.

Possibly the most remarkable and forward-looking provision which S. 1057 contains is that entitled "Services Other Than Counsel." An adequate representation commonly entails more than the mere presence of a lawyer in court. To prepare his defense, he may need investigative, expert, or other services. These are accorded by the terms of the bill, whether the accused has appointed or retained counsel. The terms of the bill provide limits for the compensation paid to a person for each such service, or to be paid an organization for each such service rendered by an employee, which again are considered reasonable under the circumstances.

These features, and others which I will not review here, were the product of careful deliberation by the conferees before adoption. I can say confidently that they represent the wisest resolution of the alternatives presented by the House and Senate versions of the bill.

There is one basic provision which the Senate bill contained but which is not found in the conference report. I refer to the option of a public defender office. In the judgment of the majority of conferees it was deemed advisable not to attempt this program at this time. Instead, the Department of Justice was requested to continue its study of such a program and, in cooperation with the Judicial Conference of the United States, to determine whether in the light of the provisions now being made for representation of the accused, a need for such a system exists. When their study is available, based upon the experience gained by the operation of the present law, the Congress will have an opportunity to re-evaluate its action and consider the advisability of an amendment.

The case for this legislation is easy to state: we are a nation dedicated to the precept of equal justice for all. Experience has abundantly demonstrated that, if this rule of law will hold out more than an illusion of justice for the indigent, we must have the means to insure adequate representation that the bill before us provides. I am grateful to those who have labored so long and so well to draft a statute which recognizes the complexities and demands of modern criminal trials. By their devotion to the highest traditions of the law and their determination to relate them to the urgent needs in the administration of criminal justice, the principle of a fair trial, so fundamental to our society, is more nearly secured.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my regret that the provision with reference to the program for public defenders was not retained. It was an important part of the bill on the Senate side.

Because of an absolutely adamant attitude on the part of the House conferees, it was necessary, if we wanted to have a bill at all, to yield on the point. I still adhere to the view that the Senate bill, on which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] was so influential, is a preferable bill. I would like to have







25. APPROPRIATIONS; POVERTY. Received from the President an appropriation estimate for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$947,500,000 to finance the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (H. Doc. 337). p. 18669
26. GUAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee granted an open rule, with 1 hour of debate, on H. R. 3869, to provide technical agricultural assistance to Guam, making it in order to substitute S. 692 in lieu thereof. p. D683
27. COFFEE. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 8864, to implement the International Coffee Agreement. p. D. 684
28. RESEARCH. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 4364, providing for duty-free entry of a mass spectrometer for Oregon State and Wayne State universities. p. D684
29. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Olsen, Mont., expressed his support for sending H. R. 1839, the meat-import restriction bill, to conference, and inserted Rep. Colmer's statement requesting the conference. pp. 18629-31
30. POVERTY. Rep. Williams explained the loyalty-oath amendments he offered to the poverty bill. p. 18631
31. RIVERS AND HARBORS. Rep. Hull inserted resolutions adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. p. 18637
32. APPALACHIA. Rep. Schwengel described a tour he made of the Appalachian region in order to secure first-hand knowledge of the situation, and inserted testimony gathered on the tour. pp. 18658-9
33. HOLIDAY. Rep. Rooney, N. Y., inserted his statement favoring legislation making Columbus Day, Oct. 12, a national holiday. p. 18659

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

34. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Olsen, Minn., inserted an article, "The Human Side of Foreign Aid," which cites the impact our foreign aid is having on the recipient nation. pp. A4266-7
35. WHEAT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burton inserting a satirical article on the wheat deal with Russia, "Happiness is a Wheat Deal With Hungry Russians." p. A4270
36. POVERTY. Speech in the House by Rep. Burton expressing his support for the poverty bill. p. A4273
37. OPINION POLL. Rep. Cleveland inserted the results of a questionnaire, including items of interest to this Department. pp. A4275-6

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

38. HEALTH. H. R. 12350, by Rep. Burton, Calif., to provide a program of national health insurance; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
39. PATENTS. H. R. 12354, by Rep. St. Onge, for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code; to Judiciary Committee.

August 12, 1964

- Passed with amendments S. 502, to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. H. R. 9752, a similar bill which was passed earlier as reported, was tabled. pp. 18598, 18611-2, 18623
13. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Passed as reported S. 1664, to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the U. S. pp. 18613-23
  14. PACIFIC ISLANDS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 3198, to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 18629
  15. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11296 (H. Rept. 1781). pp. 18588-94, 18669
  16. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 11579. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18575
  17. WILDLIFE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2392, to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with States (H. Rept. 1768). p. 18669
  18. FOOD ADDITIVES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12033, to further amend the transitional provisions of the act of 1958 prohibiting the use of food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety (H. Rept. 1770). p. 18669
  19. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1712, to authorize the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands (H. Rept. 1778). p. 18669
  20. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 8526, amended, relating to the issuance of patents for lands held under color of title, to liberalize the requirements for the conveyance of the mineral estate. p. D682
  21. ROADS AND TRAILS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12289, amended, to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission. p. D683
  22. TIME STANDARDS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11483, amended, to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement and to promote the observance of such time standards for all purposes. p. D683
  23. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5376, to provide for the inclusion in computation of accredited service for retirement purposes, of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; and H. R. 8544, to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and Classification Act of 1949. p. D683
  24. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee S. 1466, amended, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies. p. D683



the collection of revenues due the Government.

Accordingly, I am returning H.R. 2262 without my approval.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 11, 1964.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

#### REPLACEMENT OF THE GREAT SEAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1964

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: House Resolution 560 provides for the replacement of the great seal of the House of Representatives. The resolution further provides that when approved by the Committee on House Administration the chairman shall notify the Speaker and it shall then become the official great seal of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on House Administration in a meeting convened July 29, 1964, a quorum being present, did formally approve the new seal and direct me to advise you of this action. An impression on a gold wafer of the new great seal and a copy of House Resolution 560 are attached.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

OMAR BURLESON,  
Chairman.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KIRWAN, FOGARTY, MAHON, JENSEN, and PILLION.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Friday to file the conference report on H.R. 11579.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the request relates to the same bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### JIM BENNETT RETIRES AS DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Jim Bennett's retirement as Director of the Federal Prison System is soon to take place. It has long since been fully earned, but it will nevertheless be a great loss to the Government. I have known him a long time. I have watched his work with appreciation and respect. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have had full opportunity to be cognizant of his great ability and his devotion to his responsibilities. So, I admire him as an extremely able administrator and as a person with many outstanding attributes.

I want to inject just a little personal note into this tribute because I think it will show something of the type of accomplishments which have marked his long and successful record. A few years ago I worked closely with Mr. Bennett in getting a new prison camp started at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. The establishment of the camp at Eglin is an example of the economy, the spirit of cooperation, and the high principles that have been characteristic of the Federal Prison System under Jim Bennett. The prisoners at Eglin perform useful work for the Air Forces for which appropriated funds are not available, and at the same time the Air Force provides housing facilities and resources for the care and training of the prisoners. Everyone profits from this arrangement—the Air Force gets needed work done, the Federal Prison System can keep its costs down, and the prisoners gain valuable employment experience and training. And, the taxpayer gets a whale of a lot for his money.

There are Federal prison camps on other Air Force bases also, and in my opinion the mutually cooperative arrangement between the Federal Prison System and the Air Force is one of the best examples of interagency cooperation in Government. It ought to be more widely emulated.

Jim Bennett has many, many accomplishments to his credit, and I wish to state my own appreciation for everything he has done to build the Federal Prison System into the splendid organization that it is and for everything he has done over the years to improve the administration of justice generally.

#### PEACE AND FREEDOM THROUGH COLD WAR VICTORY

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking book is being published today under the auspices of the American Security Council.

This slim but fact-packed volume is entitled "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory." It was 2 years in preparation by the 28 national figures who comprise the national strategy committee of the council. This committee is headed by Robert Galvin, chairman of the board of Motorola, Inc., and the cochairman is Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar Association.

John M. Fisher, president of the American Security Council, points out that the publication is subtitled "Guidelines for Cold War Victory," and he describes it as "a synthesis of the best liberal, moderate, and conservative thinking on how we can win the cold war without a nuclear war."

Taking the premise that the cold war is not, inevitably, a conflict without end, this book suggests courses in national policy which could contribute significantly to eventual victory. As such, it should stimulate productive discussion on a nonpartisan basis of what our strategy should be against the many-pronged worldwide relentless and resourceful attack of the Communist conspiracy.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD STAY REAPPORTIONMENT

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, surely we are not going to adjourn this session of Congress without acting to stay reapportionment of State legislative bodies, pending ratification of a constitutional amendment to confirm that the States may apportion at least one house. If we do not act now in this Congress, many State legislative bodies will be reapportioned even before the next Congress returns. Federal courts are issuing orders to this effect on a wholesale basis. Legislatures once reapportioned, of course, will not ratify a constitutional amendment disenfranchising many of its



new members. None know this any better than the determined few on the U.S. Supreme Court who, indifferent to the true Constitution of this land, are willfully rewriting our laws in their own image.

The people have only this Congress left for their protection in the defense and preservation of the Constitution of the United States. There is no appeal from the U.S. Supreme Court except by the people to the Congress.

There is no more important domestic issue demanding action by Congress now. The Judiciary Committee should report a bill and a joint resolution this week.

#### AUTHORITY TO FILE ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON H.R. 12298

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file my additional views on H.R. 12298.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### THE VIETNAM SITUATION AND THE RADAR CLAIMS

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, just 24 hours ago in this forum I pointed out the obvious flaw in the administration's claim that President Johnson's announcement 1 hour and 39 minutes before U.S. naval reprisal against North Vietnamese installations did not tip our hand because our aircraft allegedly had already been picked up on North Vietnamese radar before the President spoke. Flying at 500 miles per hour our jet aircraft would cover 825 miles in that length of time. Hong Kong is about that distance from the points of attack. Obviously North Vietnam possesses no such long-distance radar capability not only to detect the aircraft, but to identify them as bent on attack. On the other hand, if the aircraft were within usual radar ranges during the 1 hour and 39 minutes, they must have been on varying courses over the high seas which could not have indicated their intention.

Yesterday I called for an explanation of this peculiar situation from the administration. None has been made. I call again for such an explanation.

#### FRASER LAUDS PASSAGE OF H.R. 1927

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Americans have long believed that the men who have defended this country in war-

time deserve the protection of pension programs. To be consistent with our commitment to provide for veterans and their survivors, we must revise these pension programs to keep them up to date. The bill we passed yesterday, H.R. 1927, provides a long-needed revision. It is an important step in the direction of insuring that veterans and their widows will be able to afford the goods and services essential for a healthful and self-respecting life.

The provisions of H.R. 1927 seek to improve the pension law in several areas. For one thing, the bill would allow new exclusions from income in determining pension eligibility. The veteran could exclude 10 percent of the total social security payments he receives in a year. This would insure that the proposed 5-percent increase in social security benefits would not cut his pension. He could exclude amounts paid for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child. He could exclude profit from nonbusiness sale of property. He could exclude payments received for jury or other civic duty. He could exclude payments received under the War Orphan's Act. He could exclude any bonus paid by a State. Finally, all of the wife's earned income could be excluded by a veteran in calculating his total income. Under the present law, he can exclude only the first \$1,200 of her income.

These "exclusion" provisions will extend well-deserved assistance to many thousands of veterans.

But the bill liberalizes the pension program in other areas as well. For example, present law requires that veterans must be 10-percent disabled and unemployable in order to receive a pension at age 65. H.R. 1927 removes this requirement. Moreover, the new bill increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from \$70 to \$100.

And the bill provides a new rate of \$35 additional per month to any veteran who is permanently housebound.

These and other provisions of H.R. 1927 will make a substantial contribution to the welfare of veterans. I hope that the Senate will act quickly to enact the bill into law.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 214 on August 8, 1964, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10199) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 11, 1964.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the amount recommended for the operation of the District of Columbia government for the fiscal year 1965 is \$341,242,200. The House approved a Federal payment of \$37.5 million to the general fund and the other body increased this amount \$3.5 million, making the total \$41 million. The amount approved by the House, \$37.5 million, was accepted in conference. The total amount for the District government as agreed to in conference is \$16,620,100 less than the budget estimates.

The loan authority of \$20 million approved by the House was also approved by the other body.

The bill provides a balanced budget in that total estimate of revenues are sufficient to meet the appropriations agreed upon and also creates a reserve of \$2,815,000 in the general fund for salary increases for employees covered by the recently enacted classified pay bill. The total police force authorized strength of 3,000 and 100 man-dog teams is funded in this legislation. We also provide for 251 new teaching positions and 17 new capital outlay projects in the public school system. Funds for a new downtown central library site are also included in this budget. In addition provision has been made for the construction of one new branch library, and plans and specifications for another one. I will include at this point in the Record a comparative summary of the bill.

(Mr. NATCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include the following table.)







House Aug. 13, 1964

18. CONTAINERS. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9334, to amend the Standard Container Act of 1928 relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, so as to permit the use of additional standard containers (S. Rept. 1429). p. 18776
  19. LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration this bill, H. R. 10803. p. D68
  20. RECLAMATION. The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration the following bills: S. J. Res. 6, to cancel unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River irrigation project, Wyo., charged against certain non-Indian lands (amended); S. 770, providing for construction and operation of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colo. and Wyo. (amended); S. 3053, to increase authorizations for construction of the Riverton Federal reclamation project; and H. R. 130, providing for payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the U. S. in connection with reclamation projects begun after January 1, 1961. p. D689
  21. AUDIT. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 4223, to provide for the audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law. pp. D690-1
- HOUSE
22. RECREATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 3846, to establish a land and water conservation fund. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18671  
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6925, to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park, Utah. p. D692
  23. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11296, and acted on items in disagreement. Prior to this action rejected, 114 to 270, a motion by Rep. Wyman to recommit the bill to conference. pp. 18672-81
  24. HOUSING; LOANS. Passed with amendments S. 3049, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. House conferees were appointed. H. R. 12175, a similar bill previously passed, 308 to 68, with amendments, was tabled. Generally, the bill would provide additional authorizations and funds to continue existing federally assisted housing programs for another year. Title V would authorize an \$150 million additional for direct loans under the rural housing program administered by the Farmers Home Administration. pp. 18682-733
  25. RESEARCH. Received the conference report on H. R. 4364, to provide for duty-free entry of mass spectrometers for Oregon State and Wayne State universities (H. Rept. 1802). pp. 18770, 18772
  26. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 11904, to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (p. 18772) Rep. Pucinski stated his intention to offer a series of amendments to remove from this bill sections which would prohibit institutions of higher learning from participating in more than one Federal loan program (p. 18735).

27. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11579 (H. Rept. 1794). pp. 18762-70
28. COFFEE. Received the conference report on H. R. 8864, to implement the International Coffee Agreement (H. Rept. 1803). pp. 18770-1
29. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Battin spoke in favor of meat-import restrictions and asked that the "administration be willing to protect American cattlemen." pp. 18740-1  
Rep. Harvey inserted an article, "Meat Import Mischief," and stated that it "is so misleading and unfair to the beef industry that its contents should not go unchallenged." pp. 18742-3
30. FOREIGN AID. Rep. McIntire protested the "squandering of taxpayers' money" for the foreign-aid program. pp. 18743-4
31. TRADE EXPANSION. Rep. Moore inserted a statement on import-export policy and urged passage of legislation which would prevent further tariff reductions in all instances in which imports have, in the past 5 years, demonstrated their competitive advantage in the domestic market. pp. 18744-6
32. LABOR STANDARDS. Rep. Cleveland discussed and outlined pending wage-and-hour legislation. pp. 18746-8
33. CLAIMS. Received from USDA a report of all claims adjudicated and paid by the Department for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act. p. 18771
34. GUAM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3869, to establish Federal agricultural services for Guam. p. 18772
35. ELECTRIFICATION. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on S. 1007, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. p. D693
36. PUBLIC LAW 480. Rep. Findley discussed the extension of Public Law 480 and urged "careful scrutiny...to the effect of Public Law 480 on our farm commodity programs." pp. 18748-9
37. SCIENCE; TECHNOLOGY. Rep. Daddario discussed a study made by the staff of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, to assess the ways in which existing sources already available can be made more effective. p. 18753
38. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Fri. H. R. 11904, to amend the National Education Act, and H. R. 3869, to furnish technical agricultural assistance to Guam, will probably be considered. p. 18734

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

39. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Evins commended and inserted a report on an interview with Rep. Mahon "which sets forth his philosophy and provides valuable insights into the complex problems of Federal financing." pp. A4284-6
40. FARM SAFETY. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke urging increased efforts to promote farm safety. pp. A4286-7



## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

---

AUGUST 13, 1964.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. KIRWAN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

### CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11579]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 8, 12, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$22,194,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$939,943,200; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$77,862,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$11,404,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,054,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$185,616,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,261,573,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
JOHN R. PILLION,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
LISTER HILL, (except for amendment No. 2),  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
PAT MCNAMARA,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

##### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$22,194,000 instead of \$20,590,00 as proposed by the House and \$22,269,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:



| Item                                                        | Approved budget<br>estimate for fiscal<br>year 1965 | Conference<br>allowance |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS                                      |                                                     |                         |
| 1. Surveys:                                                 |                                                     |                         |
| (a) Navigation studies-----                                 | \$2, 257, 000                                       | \$3, 135, 000           |
| (b) Flood control studies-----                              | 5, 835, 000                                         | 7, 091, 000             |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperatives studies-----                 | 458, 000                                            | 523, 000                |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies:                            |                                                     |                         |
| Big Black River, Miss-----                                  | 65, 000                                             | 65, 000                 |
| Big Muddy River, Ill-----                                   | 125, 000                                            | 125, 000                |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H-----    | 275, 000                                            | 275, 000                |
| Genesee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa-----                       | 130, 000                                            | 130, 000                |
| Grand River Basin, Mich-----                                | 175, 000                                            | 175, 000                |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C-----                    | 250, 000                                            | 250, 000                |
| Missouri River Basin-----                                   | 250, 000                                            | 250, 000                |
| Ohio River Basin review-----                                | 375, 000                                            | 375, 000                |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss-----                           | 125, 000                                            | 200, 000                |
| Pearl River Basin, Miss-----                                | 125, 000                                            | 125, 000                |
| Puget Sound area, Washington-----                           | 275, 000                                            | 275, 000                |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex----- | 300, 000                                            | 300, 000                |
| Sabine River, Tex-----                                      | 130, 000                                            | 130, 000                |
| St. Johns River Basin, Maine-----                           | 75, 000                                             | 75, 000                 |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md-----             | 400, 000                                            | 400, 000                |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin-----                          | 350, 000                                            | 350, 000                |
| Wabash River, Ind. and Ill-----                             | 425, 000                                            | 550, 000                |
| White River Basin, Ark. and Mo-----                         | 300, 000                                            | 300, 000                |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg-----                           | 350, 000                                            | 350, 000                |

| Item                                                                                 | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 | Conference allowance |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—continued                                                     |                                               |                      |
| 1. Surveys—Continued                                                                 |                                               |                      |
| (e) Special studies:                                                                 |                                               |                      |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana | \$125, 000                                    | \$125, 000           |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)      | 260, 000                                      | 260, 000             |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.                                              | 200, 000                                      | 200, 000             |
| Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J.                                                        | 150, 000                                      | 150, 000             |
| Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.                                                     | 200, 000                                      | 200, 000             |
| Texas coast                                                                          | 250, 000                                      | 250, 000             |
| Subtotal, surveys                                                                    | 14, 035, 000                                  | 16, 634, 000         |
| 2. Collection and study of basic data:                                               |                                               |                      |
| Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)                                               | 280, 000                                      | 280, 000             |
| Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)                                          | 480, 000                                      | 480, 000             |
| Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)          | 210, 000                                      | 210, 000             |
| International water studies                                                          | 85, 000                                       | 85, 000              |
| Food plain studies                                                                   | 725, 000                                      | 725, 000             |
| Subtotal, collection and study of basic data                                         | 1, 780, 000                                   | 1, 780, 000          |

|                                                        |            |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| 3. Research and development:                           |            |              |
| Coastal engineering research and development-----      | 850,000    | 850,000      |
| Hydrologic studies-----                                | 190,000    | 190,000      |
| Civil works investigations-----                        | 1,500,000  | 1,500,000    |
| Mississippi Basin model:                               |            |              |
| Mississippi River comprehensive study-----             | 210,000    | 210,000      |
| Maintenance-----                                       | 150,000    | 150,000      |
| Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction----- | 1,080,000  | 1,080,000    |
| Subtotal, research and development-----                | 3,980,000  | 3,980,000    |
| General reduction due to slippage-----                 | -----      | -----200,000 |
| Total, general investigations-----                     | 19,795,000 | 22,194,000   |



Within the amount provided above the House figure \$56,000 is for the Coast of Hawaiian Islands Study. The \$75,000 budgeted for the Nenana River, Alaska Study, has been deleted. The conferees of both Houses are in agreement on the Senate report statement on Comprehensive River Basin Studies.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$939,943,200 instead of \$905,767,200 as proposed by the House and \$942,791,200 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

| Construction, general, State and project          | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                                   | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| Alabama:                                          |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)           |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Claiborne lock and dam                            | \$1,000,000                                          |           | \$1,000,000          |           |
| Holt lock and dam                                 | 8,000,000                                            |           | 8,000,000            |           |
| Jones Bluff lock and dam                          |                                                      | \$134,000 |                      | \$134,000 |
| Millers Ferry lock and dam                        | 6,000,000                                            |           | 6,000,000            |           |
| Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel                     | 1,500,000                                            |           | 2,476,000            |           |
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss       |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)       |                                                      | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| Alaska:                                           |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Repairs on other navigation projects in Alaska    |                                                      |           | 500,000              |           |
| Snettisham power project                          |                                                      | 750,000   |                      | 750,000   |
| Arizona:                                          |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Alamo Reservoir                                   | 2,500,000                                            |           | 2,500,000            |           |
| Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Pinal Creek                                       |                                                      | 251,000   |                      | 251,000   |
| Tucson diversion channel                          | 2,400,000                                            | 55,000    | 2,400,000            | 55,000    |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                   | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                            | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| Arkansas:                                                                                  |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas<br>and Oklahoma:                              |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (a) Bank stabilization and channel<br>rectification-----                                   | \$15, 000, 000                                       | -----      | \$15, 000, 000       | -----      |
| (b) Navigation locks and dams-----                                                         | 51, 500, 000                                         | -----      | 51, 500, 000         | -----      |
| (MP) Beaver Reservoir-----                                                                 | 4, 500, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 500, 000          | -----      |
| (MP) Dardanelle lock and dam-----                                                          | 10, 000, 000                                         | -----      | 10, 000, 000         | -----      |
| (FC) De Queen Reservoir-----                                                               | -----                                                | \$245, 000 | -----                | \$245, 000 |
| (MP) Degray Reservoir-----                                                                 | 7, 100, 000                                          | -----      | 7, 100, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Dierks Reservoir-----                                                                 | -----                                                | 150, 000   | -----                | 150, 000   |
| (FC) Garland City-----                                                                     | 250, 000                                             | -----      | 250, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Gillham Reservoir-----                                                                | 2, 500, 000                                          | -----      | 2, 500, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Maniece Bayou, upstream extension-----                                                | 100, 000                                             | -----      | 100, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Millwood Reservoir-----                                                               | 17, 697, 000                                         | -----      | 17, 697, 000         | -----      |
| (MP) Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit-----                                           | 350, 000                                             | -----      | 350, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La-----                                            | 3, 000, 000                                          | -----      | 3, 000, 000          | -----      |
| (N) Ozark lock and dam-----                                                                | 1, 000, 000                                          | -----      | 1, 000, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization<br>below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex----- | 300, 000                                             | -----      | 300, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry<br>Levee Districts-----                      | -----                                                | \$7, 000   | -----                | \$7, 000   |
| California:                                                                                |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam-----                                                     | 750, 000                                             | -----      | 750, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Bear Creek-----                                                                       | 900, 000                                             | -----      | 900, 000             | -----      |



|      |                                                            |            |         |            |         |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | Buchanan Reservoir                                         | 200,000    | 200,000 | 3,350,000  | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Camanche Reservoir                                         | 100,000    | 100,000 | 3,350,000  | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Corte Madera Creek                                         | 100,000    | 100,000 |            | 100,000 |
| (N)  | Dana Point Harbor                                          |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement | 450,000    | 450,000 |            | 450,000 |
| (FC) | Hidden Reservoir                                           | 250,000    | 250,000 |            | 250,000 |
| (BE) | Imperial Beach (reimbursement)                             | 26,000     |         | 26,000     |         |
| (FC) | Los Angeles County drainage area                           | 15,000,000 |         | 15,000,000 |         |
| (FC) | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries                    | 1,000,000  |         | 1,000,000  |         |
| (N)  | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor                              | 600,000    |         | 600,000    |         |
|      | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)      |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Merced River Reservoirs                                    | 50,000     | 50,000  | 200,000    |         |
| (N)  | Monterey Harbor                                            | 90,000     | 90,000  |            | 90,000  |
| (FC) | Mormon Slough                                              | 75,000     | 75,000  |            | 75,000  |
| (MP) | New Melones Reservoir                                      | 450,000    | 450,000 |            | 700,000 |
| (N)  | Oakland Inner Harbor                                       |            |         |            | 110,000 |
| (FC) | Oroville Reservoir                                         | 9,000,000  |         | 8,390,000  |         |
| (BE) | Point Mugu to San Pedro (reimbursement)                    | 196,000    |         | 196,000    |         |
| (FC) | Redwood Creek                                              | 1,150,000  | 125,000 | 1,250,000  | 125,000 |
| (FC) | Sacramento River bank protection                           |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries           | 1,530,000  |         | 1,530,000  |         |
| (N)  | Sacramento River deep water ship channel                   | 350,000    |         | 350,000    |         |
| (N)  | Santa Barbara Harbor                                       |            |         |            | 150,000 |
| (N)  | Santa Cruz Harbor                                          | 105,000    |         | 105,000    |         |
| (FC) | Tahchevah Creek                                            | 830,000    |         | 1,160,000  |         |
| (BE) | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)                      | 224,000    |         | 224,000    |         |
| (FC) | Walnut Creek                                               | 1,810,000  |         | 1,810,000  |         |
| (FC) | West Fork Reservoir                                        |            | 207,000 |            | 207,000 |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                                    | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                                                             | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| Colorado:                                                                                                                   |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Trinidad Reservoir                                                                                                     |                                                      |            | \$750, 000           |            |
| Connecticut:                                                                                                                |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Ansonia-Derby                                                                                                          |                                                      | \$175, 000 |                      | \$175, 000 |
| (FC) Black Rock Reservoir                                                                                                   |                                                      | 50, 000    |                      | 50, 000    |
| (FC) Colebrook River Reservoir                                                                                              | \$500, 000                                           |            | 500, 000             |            |
| (N) Connecticut River below Hartford—North<br>Cove                                                                          |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Hancock Brook Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                      |            | 578, 000             |            |
| (FC) Hop Brook Reservoir                                                                                                    | 1, 279, 000                                          |            | 1, 279, 000          |            |
| (FC) New London Barrier                                                                                                     | 400, 000                                             |            | 400, 000             |            |
| (FC) Northfield Brook Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                      | 100, 000   |                      | 100, 000   |
| (FC) Stamford                                                                                                               | 1, 346, 000                                          |            | 1, 346, 000          |            |
| (FC) West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                                | 1, 700, 000                                          |            | 1, 700, 000          |            |
| (FC) West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                                | 2, 300, 000                                          |            | 2, 300, 000          |            |
| Delaware:                                                                                                                   |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchor-<br>ages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsyl-<br>vania. (See New Jersey.)        |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (N) Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesa-<br>peake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware<br>Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | 11, 500, 000                                         |            | 11, 500, 000         |            |
| (BE) Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet<br>(reimbursement)                                                                | 110, 000                                             |            | 110, 000             |            |

|          |                                                                               |            |            |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Florida: |                                                                               |            |            |
| (N)      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                       |            |            |
| (N)      | Apalachicola River channel improvement                                        | 100,000    | 100,000    |
| (N)      | Canaveral Harbor                                                              | 3,900,000  | 3,900,000  |
| (FC)     | Central and southern Florida                                                  | 13,800,000 | 14,150,000 |
| (N)      | Cross Florida barge canal                                                     | 4,000,000  | 4,000,000  |
| (FC)     | Four River Basins                                                             | 200,000    | 200,000    |
| (N)      | Intracoastal Waterway:                                                        |            |            |
|          | (a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River                                     |            |            |
| (N)      | Miami Harbor                                                                  | 700,000    | 850,000    |
| (BE)     | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement) | 1,076,000  | 1,076,000  |
| (N)      | Palm Beach Harbor                                                             | 10,000     | 10,000     |
| (N)      | Pensacola Harbor                                                              | 1,300,000  | 1,300,000  |
| (N)      | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)                                             | 300,000    | 550,000    |
| (N)      | Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channel                                    | 1,254,000  | 1,254,000  |
| (N)      |                                                                               | 150,000    | 150,000    |
| Georgia: |                                                                               |            |            |
| (MP)     | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                       |            |            |
| (N)      | Carters Dam                                                                   | 6,000,000  | 6,000,000  |
| (N)      | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin                                   | 340,000    | 340,000    |
| (MP)     | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.                                            | 500,000    | 500,000    |
| Hawaii:  |                                                                               |            |            |
| (N)      | Nawiliwili Harbor (sec. 107)                                                  |            | (144,000)  |
| (N)      | Hilo Harbor                                                                   | 550,000    |            |
| (R)      | Kahului Harbor (breakwater)                                                   | 1,000,000  | 1,000,000  |
| (FC)     | Kawainui Swamp                                                                | 700,000    | 700,000    |
| Idaho:   |                                                                               |            |            |
| (FC)     | Blackfoot Reservoir                                                           | 46,000     | 46,000     |
| (MP)     | Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir                                              | 8,500,000  | 8,500,000  |
| (FC)     | Heise-Roberts Extension                                                       | 70,000     | 70,000     |
| (FC)     | Ririe Reservoir                                                               |            | 400,000    |



| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                              | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |                | Conference allowance   |                |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
|                                          |                                                                                                                              | Construction                                         | Planning       | Construction           | Planning       |
|                                          | Illinois:                                                                                                                    |                                                      |                |                        |                |
| (BA)                                     | Calumet River, bridges-----                                                                                                  | \$1,300,000                                          | -----          | \$1,300,000            | -----          |
| (N)                                      | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:<br>(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and<br>Lake Calumet (1962 act)-----           | 1,500,000                                            | -----          | 2,500,000              | -----          |
|                                          | (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot<br>outer harbor-----                                                                   | 2,500,000                                            | -----          | 2,500,000              | -----          |
| (FC)                                     | Carlyle Reservoir-----                                                                                                       | 7,200,000                                            | -----          | 7,200,000              | -----          |
| (R)                                      | Chicago Harbor (breakwater)-----                                                                                             | 700,000                                              | -----          | 700,000                | -----          |
| (FC)                                     | East St. Louis and vicinity-----                                                                                             | 400,000                                              | -----          | 400,000                | -----          |
| (FC)                                     | England Pond levee-----                                                                                                      |                                                      | \$125,000      |                        | \$30,000       |
| (FC)                                     | Freeport-----                                                                                                                |                                                      |                |                        | 125,000        |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 1-----                                                                                |                                                      |                | 100,000                |                |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 2-----                                                                                |                                                      |                | 100,000                |                |
| (N)                                      | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modifica-<br>tion, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana-----                                           | 5,000,000                                            | -----          | 5,000,000              | -----          |
| (FC)                                     | Indian Grave Drainage District-----                                                                                          |                                                      | 96,000         |                        | 96,000         |
|                                          | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See<br>Indiana.)-----                                                                   |                                                      |                |                        |                |
| (N)                                      | Kaskaskia River-----                                                                                                         |                                                      | 400,000        |                        | 400,000        |
| (FC)                                     | McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District-----                                                                                 |                                                      | 140,000        |                        | 140,000        |
| (N)                                      | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri<br>Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:<br>(a) Regulating works-----<br>(b) Chain of Rocks----- | 2,000,000<br>1,300,000                               | -----<br>----- | 2,000,000<br>1,300,000 | -----<br>----- |

|      |                                                                                                |            |         |            |         |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | Mount Carmel-----                                                                              | 700,000    | -----   | 700,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | New Athens-----                                                                                | 120,000    | -----   | 120,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Oakley Reservoir-----                                                                          | -----      | 275,000 | -----      | 275,000 |
| (FC) | Prairie Du-Pont Levee and Sanitary District-----                                               | -----      | -----   | -----      | 47,000  |
| (FC) | Rend Lake Reservoir-----                                                                       | 1,000,000  | -----   | 1,000,000  | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Richland Creek-----                                                                            | -----      | 200,000 | -----      | -----   |
| (FC) | Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee-----                                                       | 750,000    | -----   | 750,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Saline River and tributaries-----                                                              | -----      | 75,000  | -----      | 75,000  |
| (FC) | Shelbyville Reservoir-----                                                                     | 2,800,000  | -----   | 2,800,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Sny Island Levee Drainage District-----                                                        | -----      | -----   | 400,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District-----      | 1,000,000  | -----   | 1,000,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | The Sny Basin-----                                                                             | 1,700,000  | -----   | 1,700,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Tri-pond levee-----                                                                            | 470,000    | -----   | 470,000    | -----   |
|      | Indiana:                                                                                       | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |
| (FC) | Brookville Reservoir-----                                                                      | -----      | 165,000 | 665,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)-----                                   | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |
| (N)  | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----                                             | 11,600,000 | -----   | 11,600,000 | -----   |
| (FC) | Evansville-----                                                                                | 900,000    | -----   | 900,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Huntington Reservoir-----                                                                      | 2,800,000  | -----   | 2,800,000  | -----   |
|      | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)----- | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |
| (FC) | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois-----                                                        | -----      | 38,000  | -----      | 38,000  |
| (FC) | Levee unit 5, Wabash River-----                                                                | 1,500,000  | -----   | 1,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Mason J. Niblack levee-----                                                                    | 170,000    | -----   | 170,000    | -----   |
|      | McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)-----                              | -----      | -----   | -----      | -----   |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                                                                            | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |                | Conference allowance       |                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                     | Construction                                      | Planning       | Construction               | Planning       |
| Indiana—Continued                                                                                                                                                   |                                                   |                |                            |                |
| (FC) Mississinewa Reservoir-----                                                                                                                                    | \$6, 000, 000                                     | -----          | \$6, 000, 000              | -----          |
| (FC) Monroe Reservoir-----                                                                                                                                          | 1, 649, 000                                       | -----          | 1, 649, 000                | -----          |
| (N) Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----                                                                                                               |                                                   | \$110, 000     | 2, 100, 000                | -----          |
| (FC) Salamonie Reservoir-----                                                                                                                                       | 5, 500, 000                                       | -----          | 5, 500, 000                | -----          |
| (N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky-----                                                                                                              | 1, 000, 000                                       | -----          | 1, 000, 000                | -----          |
| Iowa:                                                                                                                                                               |                                                   |                |                            |                |
| (FC) Central City Reservoir (restudy)-----                                                                                                                          | -----                                             | -----          | -----                      | \$60, 000      |
| (FC) Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge-----                                                                                                                     | 500, 000                                          | -----          | 500, 000                   | -----          |
| (FC) Des Moines-----                                                                                                                                                | 200, 000                                          | -----          | 200, 000                   | -----          |
| (FC) Dubuque-----                                                                                                                                                   |                                                   | 100, 000       | -----                      | 100, 000       |
| (FC) Floyd River and tributaries-----                                                                                                                               | 3, 221, 000                                       | -----          | 3, 299, 000                | -----          |
| (FC) Green Bay Levee Drainage District No. 2-----                                                                                                                   | 500, 000                                          | -----          | 500, 000                   | -----          |
| (FC) Indian Creek Dam-----                                                                                                                                          | 300, 000                                          | -----          | 300, 000                   | -----          |
| (FC) Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16-----                                                                                                              | 1, 500, 000                                       | -----          | 1, 500, 000                | -----          |
| (FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska-----                                                                                  | 4, 000, 000                                       | -----          | 4, 000, 000                | -----          |
| (N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:<br>(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.--<br>(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City----- | 3, 500, 000<br>2, 700, 000                        | -----<br>----- | 4, 500, 000<br>4, 800, 000 | -----<br>----- |



|      |                                                                                         |            |         |            |         |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| (FC) | (c) Kansas City to the mouth                                                            | 3,500,000  | -----   | 3,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Rathbun Reservoir                                                                       | 1,750,000  | -----   | 1,750,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Red Rock Reservoir                                                                      | 16,500,000 | -----   | 16,500,000 | -----   |
| (FC) | Saylorville Reservoir                                                                   | 1,200,000  | -----   | 1,200,000  | -----   |
|      | Kansas:                                                                                 |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Atchison                                                                                |            | 160,000 |            | 160,000 |
| (FC) | Big Hill Reservoir                                                                      |            | 100,000 |            | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Clinton Reservoir                                                                       |            | 240,000 |            | 240,000 |
| (FC) | Council Grove Reservoir                                                                 | 688,000    | -----   | 688,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Elk City Reservoir                                                                      | 7,500,000  | -----   | 7,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Fort Scott Reservoir                                                                    |            | -----   |            | 100,000 |
| (FC) | John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir                                                         | 1,288,000  | -----   | 1,288,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)                                                  |            | 100,000 |            | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Lawrence                                                                                | 300,000    | -----   | 300,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Marion Reservoir                                                                        | 2,700,000  | -----   | 3,000,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Marysville                                                                              |            | -----   | 200,000    | -----   |
| (FC) | Melvorn Reservoir                                                                       |            | -----   |            | 230,000 |
| (FC) | Merriam                                                                                 |            | 40,000  |            | 40,000  |
| (FC) | Milford Reservoir                                                                       | 16,000,000 | -----   | 16,000,000 | -----   |
|      | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)   |            |         |            |         |
|      | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) |            |         |            |         |
| (FC) | Perry Reservoir                                                                         | 8,500,000  | -----   | 8,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Topeka                                                                                  | 4,500,000  | -----   | 4,500,000  | -----   |
| (FC) | Wilson Reservoir                                                                        | 2,900,000  | -----   | 2,900,000  | -----   |

| Construction, general, State and project                                | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                                                         | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction         | Planning  |
| Kentucky:                                                               |                                                      |            |                      |           |
| (MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.-----                                    | \$15, 400, 000                                       | -----      | \$15, 400, 000       | -----     |
| (FC) Bellvue (deferred) and Dayton (inactive)-----                      | -----                                                | -----      | -----                | \$25, 000 |
| (FC) Booneville Reservoir-----                                          | -----                                                | \$100, 000 | -----                | 100, 000  |
| Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and<br>Kentucky. (See Indiana.)        |                                                      |            |                      |           |
| (N) Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam,<br>Kentucky and Ohio-----    | 6, 365, 000                                          | -----      | 6, 365, 000          | -----     |
| (FC) Carr Fork Reservoir-----                                           | 830, 000                                             | -----      | 830, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Cave Run Reservoir-----                                            | 1, 300, 000                                          | -----      | 1, 300, 000          | -----     |
| (FC) Cumberland-----                                                    | 490, 000                                             | -----      | 490, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Eagle Creek Reservoir-----                                         | -----                                                | 150, 000   | -----                | 150, 000  |
| (FC) Fishtrap Reservoir-----                                            | 10, 400, 000                                         | -----      | 18, 000, 000         | -----     |
| (FC) Frankfort-----                                                     | -----                                                | 130, 000   | -----                | 130, 000  |
| (FC) Grayson Reservoir-----                                             | 4, 200, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 200, 000          | -----     |
| (FC) Green River Reservoir-----                                         | 4, 000, 000                                          | -----      | 4, 000, 000          | -----     |
| (MP) Laurel River Reservoir-----                                        | -----                                                | -----      | 500, 000             | -----     |
| (N) McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indi-<br>ana and Kentucky----- | 2, 800, 000                                          | -----      | 2, 800, 000          | -----     |
| Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and<br>Kentucky. (See Indiana.)         |                                                      |            |                      |           |
| (FC) Red River Reservoir-----                                           | -----                                                | 150, 000   | -----                | 150, 000  |
| (FC) Sturgis floodwall-----                                             | -----                                                | -----      | -----                | 75, 000   |
| Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and<br>Kentucky. (See Indiana.)        |                                                      |            |                      |           |

|      |                                                                                                                      |  |             |          |               |          |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| (N)  | Louisiana:                                                                                                           |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas. |  | 1, 000, 000 |          | 1, 000, 000   |          |
|      | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway                                                                          |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Calcasieu River and Pass                                                                                             |  | 800, 000    |          | 800, 000      |          |
|      | Calcasieu River, salt-water barrier                                                                                  |  | 4, 000, 000 |          | 5, 000, 000   |          |
|      | Campti Clarence levee                                                                                                |  | 1, 000, 000 |          | 1, 000, 000   |          |
|      | Comite (Sec. 205)                                                                                                    |  | 500, 000    |          | 500, 000      |          |
|      | Freshwater Bayou                                                                                                     |  |             |          | (1, 000, 000) |          |
|      | Mississippi River, gulf outlet                                                                                       |  | 1, 400, 000 |          | 1, 400, 000   |          |
|      | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)                                                                |  | 8, 750, 000 |          | 9, 250, 000   |          |
| (N)  | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)                                                              |  | 750, 000    |          | 750, 000      |          |
|      | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)                       |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Maine:                                                                                                               |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel                                                                                     |  | 1, 700, 000 |          | 1, 850, 000   |          |
| (N)  | Maryland:                                                                                                            |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)                                          |  |             |          |               |          |
|      | Baltimore Harbor and Channel                                                                                         |  | 3, 300, 000 |          | 3, 500, 000   |          |
|      | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.                                                                                |  |             |          |               |          |
| (FC) | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.)            |  |             | 350, 000 |               | 350, 000 |



| Construction, general, State and project                         | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                                                  | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| Massachusetts:                                                   |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (N) Boston Harbor, Chelsea River-----                            | \$550, 000                                           | -----     | \$550, 000           | -----     |
| (R) Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge-----                           | 500, 000                                             | -----     | 500, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Chicopee Falls-----                                         | 620, 000                                             | -----     | 620, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Conant Brook Reservoir-----                                 | 1, 000, 000                                          | -----     | 1, 000, 000          | -----     |
| (N) Gloucester Harbor-----                                       | 830, 000                                             | -----     | 830, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Littleville Reservoir-----                                  | 1, 936, 000                                          | -----     | 1, 936, 000          | -----     |
| (N) Marblehead Harbor-----                                       | -----                                                | -----     | -----                | \$50, 000 |
| (FC) New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Bar-<br>rier-----        | 4, 000, 000                                          | -----     | 4, 000, 000          | -----     |
| (FC) Three Rivers-----                                           | 435, 000                                             | -----     | 435, 000             | -----     |
| (FC) Wareham-Marion-----                                         | -----                                                | \$75, 000 | -----                | 75, 000   |
| (FC) Westfield-----                                              | 300, 000                                             | -----     | 300, 000             | -----     |
| Michigan:                                                        |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (R) Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)-----                | 150, 000                                             | -----     | 150, 000             | -----     |
| (N) Gladstone Harbor-----                                        | 617, 000                                             | -----     | 617, 000             | -----     |
| (N) Great Lakes connecting channels-----                         | 1, 000, 000                                          | -----     | 1, 000, 000          | -----     |
| (N) Leland Harbor-----                                           | -----                                                | -----     | -----                | 30, 000   |
| (R) Ludington Harbor (north revetment)-----                      | 172, 000                                             | -----     | 172, 000             | -----     |
| (R) Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)-----                    | 500, 000                                             | -----     | 500, 000             | -----     |
| (R) Marquette Harbor-----                                        | 150, 000                                             | -----     | 150, 000             | -----     |
| (N) Muskegon Harbor-----                                         | 560, 000                                             | -----     | 560, 000             | -----     |
| (R) Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and<br>revetments)----- | 150, 000                                             | -----     | 150, 000             | -----     |

|              |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| (N)          | New Buffalo Harbor-----                                                                                      | -----     | -----   | -----     | 50,000  |
| (N)          | Ontonagon Harbor-----                                                                                        | -----     | 91,000  | -----     | 91,000  |
| (FC)         | Rouge River-----                                                                                             | -----     | 178,000 | 400,000   | -----   |
| (N)          | St. Marys River: New Poe lock-----                                                                           | 5,500,000 | -----   | 5,500,000 | -----   |
| (FC)         | Saginaw River (flood control)-----                                                                           | 750,000   | -----   | 750,000   | -----   |
| (N)          | Saginaw River (navigation)-----                                                                              | -----     | 120,000 | -----     | 120,000 |
| Minnesota:   |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
| (N)          | Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:<br>Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels                        | 675,000   | -----   | 675,000   | -----   |
| (FC)         | Lost River-----                                                                                              | 250,000   | -----   | 250,000   | -----   |
| (N)          | Minnesota River, 9-foot channel-----                                                                         | -----     | -----   | 1,000,000 | -----   |
| (R)          | Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi<br>River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron<br>and cutoff walls)----- | 1,000,000 | -----   | -----     | -----   |
| (FC)         | Rushford-----                                                                                                | 235,000   | -----   | 235,000   | -----   |
| (FC)         | St. Paul and South St. Paul-----                                                                             | 600,000   | 80,000  | 600,000   | 80,000  |
| (FC)         | Winona-----                                                                                                  | 800,000   | -----   | 800,000   | -----   |
| Mississippi: |                                                                                                              |           |         |           |         |
|              | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                      | -----     | -----   | -----     | -----   |
| (FC)         | Jackson and East Jackson-----                                                                                | -----     | -----   | 800,000   | -----   |
| (FC)         | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir-----                                                                               | 500,000   | -----   | 500,000   | -----   |
| (N)          | Pascagoula Harbor-----                                                                                       | 620,000   | -----   | 620,000   | -----   |
|              | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and<br>Miss. (See Alabama.)                                               | -----     | -----   | -----     | -----   |
| (FC)         | Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama<br>and Mississippi-----                                             | -----     | -----   | 400,000   | -----   |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                     | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |             | Conference allowance |             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
|                                                                                              | Construction                                         | Planning    | Construction         | Planning    |
| Missouri:                                                                                    |                                                      |             |                      |             |
| (FC) Chariton River-----                                                                     | \$650, 000                                           | -----       | \$650, 000           | -----       |
| (FC) Hannibal-----                                                                           | -----                                                | \$155, 000  | -----                | \$155, 000  |
| (MP) Joanna Reservoir-----                                                                   | -----                                                | 434, 000    | -----                | 434, 000    |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir-----                                                          | -----                                                | -----       | -----                | -----       |
| (MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction-----                                    | 1, 500, 000                                          | -----       | 1, 500, 000          | -----       |
| (FC) Marion County Drainage District-----                                                    | -----                                                | -----       | -----                | -----       |
| (FC) Meramec Park Reservoir-----                                                             | 1, 000, 000                                          | -----       | 1, 000, 000          | -----       |
| Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)-----        | 764, 000                                             | -----       | 764, 000             | -----       |
| Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)-----    | -----                                                | -----       | -----                | 200, 000    |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)----- | -----                                                | -----       | -----                | -----       |
| (FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3-----                              | 596, 000                                             | -----       | 596, 000             | -----       |
| (FC) South River Drainage District-----                                                      | 499, 000                                             | -----       | 499, 000             | -----       |
| (FC) St. Louis-----                                                                          | 10, 000, 000                                         | -----       | 10, 000, 000         | -----       |
| (MP) Stockton Reservoir-----                                                                 | 4, 000, 000                                          | -----       | 4, 000, 000          | -----       |
| Montana:                                                                                     |                                                      |             |                      |             |
| (FC) Billings (deferred)-----                                                                | -----                                                | 1, 000, 000 | -----                | 25, 000     |
| (MP) Libby Reservoir-----                                                                    | -----                                                | -----       | -----                | 1, 000, 000 |



|                      |                                                                                         |           |         |  |           |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|--|-----------|
| (FC)<br>(R)<br>(FC)  | Nebraska:                                                                               |           |         |  |           |
|                      | Gering Valley                                                                           | 1,400,000 |         |  | 1,400,000 |
|                      | Harlan County Reservoir (slope protection)                                              | 1,600,000 |         |  | 1,600,000 |
|                      | Little Papillion Creek                                                                  |           |         |  | 80,000    |
| (FC)<br>(FC)<br>(FC) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)   |           |         |  |           |
|                      | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) |           |         |  |           |
|                      | Norfolk                                                                                 | 300,000   |         |  | 300,000   |
|                      | Salt Creek and tributaries                                                              | 3,000,000 |         |  | 3,000,000 |
| (FC)                 | Nevada:                                                                                 |           | 125,000 |  | 200,000   |
| (FC)                 | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.                                                 |           |         |  |           |
| (FC)                 | New Hampshire:                                                                          |           |         |  |           |
| (BE)<br>(N)          | Hampton Beach erosion (reimbursement)                                                   |           |         |  | 109,000   |
| (R)<br>(N)           | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.                                  | 1,500,000 |         |  | 1,500,000 |
|                      | New Jersey:                                                                             |           |         |  |           |
|                      | Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)                                                             | 488,000   |         |  | 488,000   |
|                      | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchors), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.  |           |         |  |           |
| (R)                  | Manasquan River (bulkheads)                                                             | 3,750,000 |         |  | 3,750,000 |
| (N)                  | Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel                          | 90,000    |         |  | 90,000    |
| (R)                  | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey        | 1,132,000 |         |  | 1,132,000 |
| (FC)                 | Rahway (sec. 205)                                                                       | 264,000   |         |  | 264,000   |
| (FC)                 | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays                                                             |           |         |  | (544,000) |
| (MP)                 | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.                                                    | 1,100,000 |         |  | 1,100,000 |
|                      |                                                                                         |           | 450,000 |  | 450,000   |

| Construction, general, State and project                                         | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                  | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| New Mexico:                                                                      |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Albuquerque-----                                                            | \$500, 000                                        | -----      | \$500, 000           | -----      |
| (FC) Cochiti Reservoir-----                                                      | -----                                             | -----      | 1, 000, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Galisteo Reservoir-----                                                     | -----                                             | -----      | 2, 300, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Las Cruces-----                                                             | -----                                             | \$192, 000 | -----                | \$192, 000 |
| New York:                                                                        |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.<br>(See Pennsylvania.)                   |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (N) Buffalo Harbor: Outer harbor--(1962 modification)-----                       | 1, 406, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 406, 000          | -----      |
| (N) Buttermilk Channel-----                                                      | 1, 300, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 300, 000          | -----      |
| (BE) Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)-----                            | -----                                             | -----      | -----                | 25, 000    |
| (BE) Fire Island Inlet, Long Island-----                                         | 1, 112, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 112, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point-----                                     | 1, 900, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 900, 000          | -----      |
| (N) Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway-----                                    | 400, 000                                          | -----      | 400, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Hudson River, New York City to Albany-----                                   | 3, 200, 000                                       | -----      | 3, 200, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet-----                                                   | 800, 000                                          | -----      | 800, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Lackawanna-----                                                             | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River-----                                    | -----                                             | 100, 000   | -----                | 100, 000   |
| (R) Little Sodus Bay (piers)-----                                                | 215, 000                                          | -----      | 215, 000             | -----      |
| (R) New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See |                                                   |            |                      |            |

| (FC) | New Jersey.)                                                              |              |  |          |              |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--|----------|--------------|
| (FC) | Nichols                                                                   |              |  | 35, 000  | 35, 000      |
| (N)  | North Ellenville                                                          |              |  |          |              |
| (FC) | Oswego Harbor (1962 act)                                                  | 300, 000     |  |          | 300, 000     |
| (FC) | Rosendale                                                                 |              |  | 100, 000 | 100, 000     |
| (FC) | Salamanca                                                                 |              |  | 75, 000  | 75, 000      |
| (FC) | South Amsterdam                                                           | 378, 000     |  |          | 378, 000     |
|      | North Carolina:                                                           |              |  |          |              |
|      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                   |              |  |          |              |
| (FC) | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection                                | 300, 000     |  |          | 678, 000     |
| (N)  | Masonboro Inlet jetties                                                   |              |  |          | 150, 000     |
| (FC) | New Hope Reservoir                                                        |              |  | 250, 000 | 250, 000     |
| (N)  | Northeast Cape Fear (sec. 107)                                            |              |  |          | (105, 200)   |
| (N)  | Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)                       |              |  |          |              |
| (FC) | Wrightsville Beach                                                        |              |  | 67, 000  | 67, 000      |
|      | North Dakota:                                                             |              |  |          |              |
| (FC) | Bowman Haley Reservoir                                                    |              |  |          | 541, 000     |
| (FC) | Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir                            | 800, 000     |  |          | 1, 200, 000  |
|      | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)                   | 800, 000     |  |          | 800, 000     |
| (FC) | Velva (sec. 205)                                                          |              |  |          | (214, 000)   |
|      | Ohio:                                                                     |              |  |          |              |
| (N)  | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                          | 16, 500, 000 |  |          | 16, 500, 000 |
| (FC) | Big Darby Creek Reservoir                                                 | 1, 000, 000  |  |          | 1, 000, 000  |
| (FC) | Buck Creek Reservoir                                                      |              |  |          | 730, 000     |
| (FC) | Caesar Creek Reservoir                                                    |              |  | 77, 000  |              |
|      | Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.) |              |  | 150, 000 | 150, 000     |



| Construction, general, State and project                                                   | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                            | Construction                                         | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| Ohio—Continued                                                                             |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (N) Cleveland Harbor (1962 act)-----                                                       |                                                      |            | \$500, 000           |            |
| (N) Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)----- | \$1, 800, 000                                        |            | 1, 800, 000          |            |
| (N) Conneaut Harbor-----                                                                   | 1, 000, 000                                          |            | 1, 000, 000          |            |
| (FC) Deer Creek Reservoir-----                                                             |                                                      | \$150, 000 | 500, 000             | \$150, 000 |
| (FC) East Fork Reservoir-----                                                              |                                                      |            |                      | 25, 000    |
| (FC) Empire (restudy)-----                                                                 |                                                      | 130, 000   |                      | 130, 000   |
| (FC) Fremont-----                                                                          |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia-----                                    |                                                      | 230, 000   |                      | 230, 000   |
| (N) Lorain Harbor-----                                                                     | 3, 000, 000                                          |            | 3, 000, 000          |            |
| (FC) North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir-----                                            |                                                      | 99, 000    |                      | 99, 000    |
| (FC) Paint Creek Reservoir-----                                                            |                                                      | 116, 000   |                      | 116, 000   |
| (N) Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia-----                                 | 7, 539, 000                                          |            | 7, 539, 000          |            |
| (N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia-----                                      |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Salt Creek Reservoir-----                                                             | 6, 200, 000                                          | 200, 000   | 6, 200, 000          | 200, 000   |
| Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)-----                            |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (FC) West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River-----                                            |                                                      |            |                      |            |
| (N) Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia-----                                | 4, 100, 000                                          |            | 4, 100, 000          |            |
| (FC) Youngstown, Crab Creek-----                                                           |                                                      | 325, 000   |                      | 325, 000   |
|                                                                                            |                                                      | 25, 000    |                      | 25, 000    |

| Oklahoma |                                                                                            |         |           |           |         |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|
|          | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)                     |         |           |           |         |
| (FC)     | Birch Reservoir                                                                            | 155,000 |           |           | 155,000 |
| (MP)     | Broken Bow Reservoir                                                                       |         | 4,800,000 |           |         |
| (FC)     | Copan Reservoir                                                                            | 150,000 |           |           | 150,000 |
| (MP)     | Eufaula Reservoir                                                                          |         | 3,000,000 |           |         |
| (FC)     | Hugo Reservoir                                                                             | 150,000 |           |           | 150,000 |
| (FC)     | Kaw Reservoir                                                                              | 200,000 |           |           | 200,000 |
| (MP)     | Keystone Reservoir                                                                         |         | 6,000,000 |           |         |
| (FC)     | Lukfata Reservoir                                                                          | 25,000  |           |           | 25,000  |
| (FC)     | Optima Reservoir                                                                           | 162,000 |           |           | 162,000 |
| (FC)     | Pine Creek Reservoir                                                                       |         | 3,500,000 |           |         |
| (MP)     | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam                                               |         |           |           |         |
| (FC)     | Skiatook Reservoir                                                                         |         | 9,000,000 |           |         |
| (N)      | Webbers Falls lock and dam                                                                 | 225,000 |           |           | 225,000 |
| Oregon:  |                                                                                            |         |           |           |         |
| (FC)     | Applegate Reservoir                                                                        |         |           |           |         |
| (FC)     | Blue River Reservoir                                                                       |         | 2,028,000 |           | 150,000 |
| (N)      | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington |         |           | 2,500,000 |         |
| (N)      | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington                                         |         |           |           |         |
| (R)      | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington                           | 130,000 |           |           | 130,000 |
| (N)      | Coos and Millicoma Rivers                                                                  |         | 1,500,000 |           |         |
| (MP)     | Cougar Reservoir                                                                           |         | 555,000   |           |         |
| (FC)     | Elk Creek                                                                                  |         | 585,000   |           |         |
| (FC)     | Fall Creek Reservoir                                                                       |         | 8,500,000 |           | 130,000 |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                   | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                                            | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| Oregon—Continued                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (MP) Green Peter Reservoir-----                                                                            | \$19, 500, 000                                    | -----      | \$19, 500, 000       | -----      |
| (MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington-----                                                     | 72, 000, 000                                      | -----      | 72, 000, 000         | -----      |
| (MP) Lost Creek Reservoir-----                                                                             | -----                                             | \$350, 000 | -----                | \$350, 000 |
| (FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington-----                                      | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Shelton Ditch-----                                                                                    | -----                                             | 100, 000   | -----                | 100, 000   |
| (R) Tillamook Bay and Harbor-----                                                                          | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection-----                                                           | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Yaquina Bay and Harbor-----                                                                            | 1, 700, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 700, 000          | -----      |
| Pennsylvania:                                                                                              |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.-----                                                          | 27, 000, 000                                      | -----      | 27, 000, 000         | -----      |
| (FC) Aylesworth Creek Reservoir-----                                                                       | -----                                             | 80, 000    | -----                | 80, 000    |
| (FC) Beltzville Reservoir-----                                                                             | -----                                             | 276, 000   | -----                | 276, 000   |
| (FC) Blanchard Reservoir-----                                                                              | -----                                             | -----      | 1, 000, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Blue Marsh Reservoir-----                                                                             | -----                                             | 100, 000   | -----                | 100, 000   |
| (FC) Butler-----                                                                                           | 762, 000                                          | -----      | 762, 000             | -----      |
| (FC) Curwensville Reservoir-----                                                                           | 3, 200, 000                                       | -----      | 3, 200, 000          | -----      |
| (N) Dam 4, Monongahela River-----                                                                          | 3, 800, 000                                       | -----      | 3, 800, 000          | -----      |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Elkland-----                                                                                          | 800, 000                                          | -----      | 800, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Erie Harbor (1962 modification)-----                                                                   | -----                                             | -----      | -----                | 25, 000    |



|      |                                                        |            |            |         |         |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| (FC) | Latrobe                                                | 300,000    | 300,000    | ---     | ---     |
| (N)  | Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River               | 5,500,000  | 5,500,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Muddy Creek Reservoir                                  | ---        | ---        | 25,000  | 25,000  |
| (FC) | Raystown Reservoir                                     | ---        | ---        | 700,000 | 700,000 |
| (FC) | Scranton                                               | ---        | ---        | 45,000  | 45,000  |
| (FC) | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.                 | 11,300,000 | 11,300,000 | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Tioga-Hammond Reservoir                                | ---        | ---        | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| (FC) | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Turtle Creek                                           | 4,500,000  | 4,500,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Union City Reservoir                                   | ---        | ---        | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Woodcock Reservoir                                     | ---        | ---        | 60,000  | 60,000  |
|      | Rhode Island:                                          | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Fox Point Barrier                                      | 1,857,000  | 1,857,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Lower Woonsocket                                       | 2,000,000  | 2,000,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (FC) | Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier                    | ---        | ---        | 65,000  | 65,000  |
| (FC) | Point Judith—Hurricane barrier                         | ---        | ---        | 100,000 | 120,000 |
| (N)  | Warwick Cove (sec. 107)                                | ---        | (200,000)  | ---     | ---     |
|      | South Carolina:                                        | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
|      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
|      | South Dakota:                                          | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
| (MP) | Big Bend Reservoir                                     | 14,500,000 | 14,500,000 | ---     | ---     |
| (MP) | Fort Randall Reservoir                                 | 1,270,000  | 1,270,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (MP) | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.                    | 4,000,000  | 4,000,000  | ---     | ---     |
|      | Tennessee:                                             | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
|      | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)             | ---        | ---        | ---     | ---     |
| (MP) | Cordell Hull lock and dam                              | 7,100,000  | 8,100,000  | ---     | ---     |
| (MP) | J. Percy Priest Reservoir                              | 12,100,000 | 12,100,000 | ---     | ---     |
| (BA) | Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.               | 413,000    | 413,000    | ---     | ---     |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                 | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                                                                          | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| Texas:                                                                                   |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                  |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (FC) Bardwell Reservoir-----                                                             | \$6,500,000                                          | -----     | \$6,500,000          | -----     |
| (FC) Big Fossil Creek-----                                                               | 1,340,000                                            | -----     | 1,340,000            | -----     |
| (R) Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)-----                                                  | 750,000                                              | -----     | 750,000              | -----     |
| (FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries-----                                                  | 2,900,000                                            | -----     | 2,900,000            | -----     |
| (FC) Canyon Reservoir-----                                                               | 614,000                                              | -----     | 614,000              | -----     |
| (FC) Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension-----                                      | 200,000                                              | -----     | 200,000              | -----     |
| (FC) Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension-----                                       | 600,000                                              | -----     | 600,000              | -----     |
| (FC) Freeport and vicinity-----                                                          | 300,000                                              | -----     | 300,000              | -----     |
| (R) Galveston Harbor (jetties)-----                                                      | 1,800,000                                            | -----     | 1,800,000            | -----     |
| (N) Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project-----                                   | 500,000                                              | -----     | 500,000              | -----     |
| (N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria-----                 | 2,955,000                                            | -----     | 2,955,000            | -----     |
| (N) Houston ship channel (40-foot project)-----                                          | 3,200,000                                            | -----     | 3,200,000            | -----     |
| (FC) Lake Kemp Reservoir-----                                                            | -----                                                | \$200,000 | -----                | \$200,000 |
| (FC) Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement-----                           | -----                                                | 225,000   | -----                | 225,000   |
| (N) Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels-----                                | 2,477,000                                            | -----     | 2,477,000            | -----     |
| (FC) Pat Mayse Reservoir-----                                                            | -----                                                | 300,000   | 1,000,000            | -----     |
| (N) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola----- | 2,000,000                                            | -----     | 2,000,000            | -----     |

|      |                                                                                                 |           |           |         |         |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| (R)  | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jet-ties)                                                 | 800,000   | 800,000   | 389,000 | 389,000 |
| (FC) | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)                                           |           |           |         |         |
|      | Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) |           |           |         |         |
| (N)  | Sabine-Neches waterway (40-foot project)                                                        |           | 1,500,000 |         |         |
| (MP) | Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam                                                                    | 5,600,000 | 5,600,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | San Antonio Channel                                                                             | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River                                                     |           | 400,000   |         | 400,000 |
| (FC) | Somerville Reservoir                                                                            | 5,200,000 | 5,200,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | Stillhouse Hollow Dam                                                                           | 3,600,000 | 3,600,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | Texas City                                                                                      | 4,300,000 | 4,300,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | Vince and Little Vince Bayous                                                                   |           | 99,000    |         | 99,000  |
| (FC) | Waco Reservoir                                                                                  | 6,326,000 | 6,326,000 |         |         |
| (N)  | Wallisville Reservoir                                                                           |           | 350,000   |         | 350,000 |
|      | Vermont:                                                                                        |           |           |         |         |
| (FC) | Gaysville Dam (restudy)                                                                         |           |           |         | 20,000  |
|      | Virginia:                                                                                       |           |           |         |         |
| (MP) | Gathright Dam                                                                                   |           |           |         | 150,000 |
| (FC) | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir                                                             | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |         |         |
| (N)  | Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay                                                                         |           | 200,000   |         |         |
| (FC) | Norfolk                                                                                         | 1,460,000 | 1,460,000 |         |         |
| (FC) | North Fork of Pound Reservoir                                                                   | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |         |         |
| (BE) | Virginia Beach (reimbursement)                                                                  | 125,000   | 125,000   |         |         |



| Construction, general, State and project                                                                   | Budget estimate for fiscal year<br>1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                                                                                            | Construction                                         | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| Washington:<br>(FC)                                                                                        |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Colfax                                                                                                     | \$1,500,000                                          |           | \$1,500,000          |           |
| Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                          |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon, and Washington. (See Oregon.) |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2                                          |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                       |                                                      |           | 50,000               |           |
| (R)                                                                                                        | 500,000                                              |           | 500,000              |           |
| Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)                                                              |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                                |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                                                                                        |                                                      |           | 75,000               |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                       | 13,000,000                                           |           | 13,000,000           |           |
| Kingston Harbor                                                                                            |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Little Goose lock and dam                                                                                  |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                 |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                       | 37,500,000                                           |           | 37,500,000           |           |
| Lower Monumental lock and dam                                                                              |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                       | 760,000                                              |           | 760,000              |           |
| (N)                                                                                                        | 790,000                                              |           | 790,000              |           |
| (N)                                                                                                        | 900,000                                              |           | 900,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                       | 700,000                                              |           | 700,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                       |                                                      | \$200,000 |                      | \$200,000 |
| Washougal area                                                                                             |                                                      |           |                      |           |
| Wynoochee River Reservoir                                                                                  |                                                      |           |                      |           |

|      |                                                                        |             |          |          |             |          |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| (FC) | West Virginia:<br>Beech Fork Reservoir                                 | -----       | 100, 000 | -----    | -----       | 150, 000 |
|      | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)          | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | Birch Reservoir (deferred)                                             | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | 50, 000  |
|      | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)                  | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | Buckhannon                                                             | 175, 000    | -----    | 175, 000 | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | East Lynn Reservoir                                                    | 500, 000    | -----    | 500, 000 | -----       | -----    |
|      | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)            | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | Justice Reservoir                                                      | -----       | 650, 000 | -----    | -----       | 650, 000 |
|      | Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)          | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (N)  | Opekiska lock and dam                                                  | 4, 800, 000 | -----    | -----    | 4, 800, 000 | -----    |
|      | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)              | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | Summersville Reservoir                                                 | 8, 244, 000 | -----    | -----    | 9, 000, 000 | -----    |
|      | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)        | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
|      | Wisconsin:<br>Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.) | -----       | -----    | -----    | -----       | -----    |
| (FC) | Eau Galle River, Spring Valley                                         | 400, 000    | -----    | 400, 000 | -----       | -----    |
| (N)  | Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)                                            | -----       | 70, 000  | -----    | -----       | 70, 000  |
| (N)  | Kenosha Harbor                                                         | 335, 000    | -----    | 335, 000 | -----       | -----    |
| (R)  | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)                             | 150, 000    | -----    | 150, 000 | -----       | -----    |

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                  | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|                                                                                                           | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction         | Planning   |
| Wisconsin—Continued                                                                                       |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Kickapoo River-----                                                                                  |                                                   | \$125, 000 |                      | \$125, 000 |
| (N) Milwaukee Harbor (1935 act)-----                                                                      | \$6, 000                                          | -----      | \$6, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)-----                                                                      | 400, 000                                          | -----      | 400, 000             | -----      |
| (R) Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)-----                                                                    | 432, 000                                          | -----      | 432, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Saxon Harbor-----                                                                                     |                                                   | -----      | 200, 000             | -----      |
| (R) Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal-----                                                            | 147, 000                                          | -----      | 147, 000             | -----      |
| Miscellaneous:                                                                                            |                                                   |            |                      |            |
| (FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation-----        | 6, 000, 000                                       | -----      | 7, 758, 000          | -----      |
| (FC) Snagging and clearing-----                                                                           | 250, 000                                          | -----      | 250, 000             | -----      |
| (N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$200,000 (sec. 107)-----  | 1, 500, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 949, 200          | -----      |
| (BE) Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$400,000----- | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |
| Recreation facilities, completed projects-----                                                            | 4, 000, 000                                       | -----      | 5, 000, 000          | -----      |
| Small authorized projects-----                                                                            | 1, 000, 000                                       | -----      | 1, 000, 000          | -----      |
| Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)-----                                           | 500, 000                                          | -----      | 500, 000             | -----      |



|     |                                                              |                                  |              |                                  |              |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| (R) | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to \$400,000)----- | 500, 000                         | -----        | 500, 000                         | -----        |
|     | Employees compensation-----                                  | 176, 000                         | -----        | 176, 000                         | -----        |
|     | Reduction for anticipated savings and slip-<br>pages-----    | -70, 000, 000                    | -----        | -70, 000, 000                    | -----        |
|     | Grand total, construction, general-----                      | 878, 439, 000<br>(899, 108, 000) | 20, 669, 000 | 917, 782, 200<br>(939, 943, 200) | 22, 161, 000 |

Within the amount above the House figure for the central and southern Florida project \$300,000 is for the Cutler drain.

The conferees agree that, if necessary, the Corps of Engineers should use its transfer authority to provide an additional \$500,000 providing full capability of the corps of \$7.7 million to expedite the construction of the Carlyle Reservoir, Ill.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Corrects a typographical error.

#### FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$77,862,000 instead of \$73,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,920,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

| Construction, general, State and project    | Approved budget estimate for<br>fiscal year 1965 |          | Conference allowance |          |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
|                                             | Construction                                     | Planning | Construction         | Planning |
|                                             |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| 1. General investigations:                  |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| (a) Examinations and surveys-----           | \$65,000                                         |          | \$125,000            |          |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data----- | 85,000                                           |          | 85,000               |          |
| Subtotal, general investigations-----       | 150,000                                          |          | 210,000              |          |
| 2. Construction and planning:               |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| Mississippi River levees-----               | 3,800,000                                        |          | 4,000,000            |          |
| Channel improvement-----                    | 24,500,000                                       |          | 26,892,000           |          |
| Memphis Harbor-----                         | 600,000                                          |          | 600,000              |          |
| Old River control-----                      | 200,000                                          |          | 200,000              |          |
| St. Francis Basin-----                      | 3,700,000                                        |          | 3,700,000            |          |
| West Tennessee tributaries-----             | 1,400,000                                        |          | 1,400,000            |          |
| Lower Arkansas River-----                   | 300,000                                          |          | 300,000              |          |
| Tensas Basin:                               |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc-----           | 900,000                                          |          | 900,000              |          |
| Red River backwater-----                    | 200,000                                          |          | 300,000              |          |
| Yazoo Basin:                                |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| Sardis Reservoir-----                       | 70,000                                           |          | 70,000               |          |
| Enid Reservoir-----                         | 40,000                                           |          | 40,000               |          |
| Arkabutla Reservoir-----                    | 40,000                                           |          | 40,000               |          |
| Grendada Reservoir-----                     | 50,000                                           |          | 50,000               |          |
| Greenwood-----                              | 700,000                                          |          | 700,000              |          |



*Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1965—Continued*

| Construction, general, State and project             | Approved budget estimate for<br>fiscal year 1965 |          | Conference allowance |          |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
|                                                      | Construction                                     | Planning | Construction         | Planning |
| 2. Construction and planning—Continued               |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| Yazoo Basin—Continued                                |                                                  |          |                      |          |
| Upper auxiliary channels-----                        | \$100, 000                                       | -----    | \$100, 000           | -----    |
| Main stem-----                                       | 800, 000                                         | -----    | 800, 000             | -----    |
| Tributaries-----                                     | 1, 600, 000                                      | -----    | 1, 600, 000          | -----    |
| Big Sunflower River, etc-----                        | 650, 000                                         | -----    | 650, 000             | -----    |
| Yazoo backwater-----                                 | 1, 850, 000                                      | -----    | 2, 000, 000          | -----    |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries-----                  | 300, 000                                         | -----    | 300, 000             | -----    |
| Atchafalaya Basin-----                               | 7, 200, 000                                      | -----    | 8, 600, 000          | -----    |
| Lake Pontchartrain-----                              | 210, 000                                         | -----    | 210, 000             | -----    |
| Subtotal, construction and planning-----             | 49, 210, 000                                     | -----    | 53, 452, 000         | -----    |
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages----- | -1, 500, 000                                     | -----    | -1, 500, 000         | -----    |
| Total, construction and planning-----                | 47, 710, 000                                     | -----    | 51, 952, 000         | -----    |
| 3. Maintenance-----                                  | 24, 000, 000                                     | -----    | 25, 700, 000         | -----    |
| Grand total-----                                     | 71, 860, 000                                     | -----    | 77, 862, 000         | -----    |

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$1,800,000 to the National Park Service to extend recreational and utility facilities in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, as proposed by the Senate.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 8: Provides \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House for investigations of projects in Alaska.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Appropriate \$11,404,000 instead of \$10,354,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,404,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide that \$11,054,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,054,000 as proposed by the House. The increase above the House figure includes \$50,000 for Alaskan investigations and \$1,000,000 for weather modification research.

## CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$185,616,500 instead of \$182,433,000 as proposed by the House and \$185,689,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

| Project                                                                                           | Budget estimate | Conference allowance |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Delivery of water to Mexico-----                                                                  |                 | \$2, 000, 000        |
| Malta, Mont., street improvement-----                                                             |                 | 26, 000              |
| Advance planning-----                                                                             |                 | 200, 000             |
| Gila project, Arizona-----                                                                        | \$200, 000      | 1, 190, 000          |
| Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California-----                                    | 1, 190, 000     | 4, 665, 000          |
| Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada-----                                              | 4, 265, 000     | 1, 482, 000          |
| Central Valley project, California-----                                                           | 1, 482, 000     | 54, 480, 000         |
| Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie-----                                                 | 55, 546, 000    | 3, 300, 000          |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado-----                                                         | 3, 300, 000     | 6, 200, 000          |
| Maun Creek project, Idaho-----                                                                    | 6, 200, 000     | 725, 000             |
| Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas-----                                                     | 725, 000        | 1, 480, 000          |
| Arbuckle project, Oklahoma-----                                                                   | 1, 480, 000     | 3, 500, 000          |
| Norman project, Oklahoma-----                                                                     | 3, 500, 000     | 3, 221, 000          |
| Baker project, upper division, Oregon-----                                                        | 3, 221, 000     | 700, 000             |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg-----                    | 700, 000        | 400, 000             |
| The Dalles project, western division, Oregon-----                                                 | 400, 000        | 2, 393, 800          |
| Canadian River project, Texas-----                                                                | 2, 393, 800     | 22, 100, 000         |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas-----                            | 22, 100, 000    | 783, 000             |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Merced division, Texas-----                              | 783, 000        | 775, 000             |
| Weber Basin project, Utah-----                                                                    | 775, 000        | 7, 936, 000          |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville, Tonasket unit, Washington----- | 7, 786, 000     | 400, 000             |
| Columbia Basin project, Washington-----                                                           | 400, 000        | 8, 300, 000          |
| Spokane Valley project, Washington-----                                                           | 6, 800, 000     | 1, 918, 000          |
| Riverton project, 3d division, Wyoming-----                                                       | 1, 918, 000     | 1, 300, 000          |
| Drainage and minor construction-----                                                              | 1, 300, 000     | 1, 412, 964          |



|                                                          |             |             |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects-----  | 4,544,251   | 4,144,251   |
| Reclamation office building-----                         |             | 2,650,000   |
| Subtotal-----                                            | 132,422,015 | 137,682,015 |
| Missouri River Basin project:                            |             |             |
| Ainsworth unit, Nebraska-----                            | 6,500,000   | 6,500,000   |
| Almena unit, Kansas-----                                 | 1,350,000   | 2,200,000   |
| East Bench unit, Montana-----                            | 780,000     | 780,000     |
| Farwell unit, Nebraska-----                              | 2,700,000   | 2,700,000   |
| Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska-----              | 665,000     | 665,000     |
| Glen Elder unit, Kansas-----                             | 8,400,000   | 8,400,000   |
| Transmission division-----                               | 22,175,000  | 21,585,000  |
| Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming-----                    | 19,950,000  | 19,950,000  |
| Drainage and minor construction-----                     | 1,915,000   | 1,915,000   |
| Investigations-----                                      | 1,743,000   | 1,893,000   |
| Advance planning-----                                    | 950,000     | 850,000     |
| Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project-----              | 67,128,000  | 67,438,000  |
| Other Department of the Interior agencies-----           | 3,349,000   | 3,371,500   |
| Total, Missouri River Basin project-----                 | 70,477,000  | 70,809,500  |
| Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation-----           | 202,899,015 | 208,491,515 |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays----- | —17,575,015 | —22,875,015 |
| Total, construction and rehabilitation-----              | 185,324,000 | 185,616,500 |

Central Valley project, California: Within the funds provided for the Central Valley project \$1,500,000 is to be used to initiate work on the Westlands Water District distribution system. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement on the Senate report statement concerning the deletion of \$2,300,000 for transmission facilities in the San Luis project.

Reclamation office building: The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that this office building is to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation at the site and in conformity with the design already approved by the Bureau.

Missouri River Basin project—Transmission division: The Conferees are in agreement that within the amount provided \$100,000 is to be used to complete studies for a transmission system in the general area between Granite Falls and Jackson, Minn.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and Spencer, Iowa.

Missouri River Basin project—Investigations: The increase over the House figure includes an additional \$75,000 for the Marias-Milk unit, Montana, investigation to determine feasibility of providing irrigation service to the lower Marias area and an additional \$150,000 for the Nebraska Mid-State project. Within available funds \$75,000 shall be used for a feasibility report on the Blue division and \$20,000 for a reconnaissance survey of the Sheep Creek unit.

Other Department of the Interior agencies: The increase above the House figure includes \$22,500 for transfer to the National Park Service for archeological work in the Missouri River Basin.

Amendment No. 12: Provides that \$83,030,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House be derived from the reclamation fund.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16: Reported in disagreement.

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

### CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$87,420,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$41,220,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement with the provisions in connection with use of the funds for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intente as set out in the Senate report.

## TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

### OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,261,573,000 instead of \$2,261,073,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,268,008,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as follows:

| Program                                                   | Budget estimate  | Conference allowance |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Raw materials-----                                        | \$267, 455, 000  | \$267, 455, 000      |
| Special nuclear materials-----                            | 401, 500, 000    | 398, 500, 000        |
| Weapons-----                                              | 771, 747, 000    | 765, 000, 000        |
| Reactor development-----                                  | 497, 900, 000    | 494, 000, 000        |
| Physical research-----                                    | 222, 000, 000    | 214, 000, 000        |
| Biology and medicine-----                                 | 80, 000, 000     | 78, 000, 000         |
| Training, education, and information-----                 | 17, 700, 000     | 15, 700, 000         |
| Isotopes development program-----                         | 10, 300, 000     | 9, 300, 000          |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives-----          | 11, 000, 000     | 11, 000, 000         |
| Community program-----                                    | 9, 035, 000      | 9, 035, 000          |
| Program direction and administration-----                 | 76, 780, 000     | 76, 000, 000         |
| Security investigation program-----                       | 7, 000, 000      | 7, 000, 000          |
| Cost of work for others-----                              | 5, 100, 000      | 5, 100, 000          |
| Change in selected resources-----                         | -18, 451, 000    | -21, 451, 000        |
| Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources----- | -36, 066, 000    | -47, 066, 000        |
| Unobligated balance brought forward-----                  | -----            | -20, 000, 000        |
| Total-----                                                | 2, 323, 000, 000 | 2, 261, 573, 000     |



The amount provided above the House figure includes \$3,500,000 for the special nuclear materials program; \$4,000,000 for the reactor development program, including \$3,000,000 for the Project Pluto; and \$4,000,000 for the physical research program.

#### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

###### LIMITATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 19: Provides a limitation of \$4,000 instead of \$6,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000 as proposed by the Senate for representation allowances.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
JOHN R. PILLION,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*



an outstanding public servant with his passing.

JOHN B. BENNETT was also a devoted family man who had great inner pride and satisfaction as a result of his fine family. Mrs. Schenck joins me in expressing our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved ones. It is our sincere hope and prayer that the Father of us all will speak to each of them in a very personal way and that through His ministrations they will receive the courage and strength to meet the long days ahead with faith and confidence.

#### COTTON FIBER PAPER AS THE ALTERNATIVE TO MICROFILM: A COMMENTARY ON GOVERNMENT RECORDKEEPING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House of Representatives on a matter of great concern, namely, the process whereby the records of this great Nation may be retained for all posterity.

One need not be an archivist or historian to appreciate the fact that our very deliberations in this body, and the decisions made at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and in the committees of this Congress will be of cosmic import in the interpretation and understanding of the future.

This said, I wonder how many people are aware of a most disturbing set of disclosures made recently by the U.S. Department of Commerce? The report, in the form of a handbook by the National Bureau of Standards, is titled "Inspection of Processed Photographic Record Films for Aging Blemishes." I urge my distinguished colleagues who are interested in the subject of recordkeeping to examine this report, and join with me in an effort to turn the tide of what could prove to be a disastrous trend.

At the outset, I would like to quote from this handbook, a most interesting study and one that is deserving of high praise. In a foreword, A. V. Astin, Director, of the National Bureau of Standards, makes the following statement:

Over the years the National Bureau of Standards has conducted considerable research on the permanence of record materials, including both paper and photographic film. Recently microscopic blemishes have been found on microfilms; apparently they had developed after the film was put in storage. Practically no information loss has been observed, but any potential threat to the permanence of Government records is a matter of concern not only to the National Bureau of Standards but to records officers throughout the Government. There is much to be learned from these blemishes and they are being studied in many laboratories.

This publication contains a description of the blemishes, illustrated with photomicrographs in color. It also describes methods used to inspect, sample, and report on the blemishes. It is felt that early publication of this information will serve to unify methods and terminology and thus aid in coordinating the various independent studies of the problem. This handbook should also provide the guidance needed for large-scale inspections of Government records.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Bureau

on this study, and I want to urge that they continue to pursue this matter. It is one that, I am certain, will stimulate a great deal of interest in this Congress.

In short, the revelation that blemishes have appeared on some microfilm records apparently "after the film was put in storage," is one that must be developed to an even greater extent.

Because microfilm can contain a great deal of information in a small space by relative standards, it is used extensively in the Government as a means of recordkeeping. It has continued to assume a role of increased importance so that a considerable portion of all records are on microfilm at the present time.

The immediate implication here is that Government records may not be as safe from deterioration as has been assumed. There may be a significant danger in putting future records to microfilm or any other recordkeeping material that has not proven itself to be permanent.

Most disturbing is the fact that the causes of the blemishes have not yet been established.

C. S. McCamy makes this point together with additional disclosures in a brief statement on the purposes of the Bureau of Standards inspection.

He states, and I quote in full:

#### INSPECTION OF PROCESSED PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD FILMS FOR AGING BLEMMISHES (By C. S. McCamy)

Inspections of microfilms have recently revealed blemishes which apparently developed 2 to 20 years after the films were processed. Most of the blemishes are small spots, usually reddish or yellowish in color, ranging from about 15 to 150 microns across. These blemishes have been classified on the basis of size, shape, color, and character. This publication describes and gives colored illustrations of the various types, describes the method of observing them, and recommends sampling procedures for microfilm inspectors. The cause, the exact mechanism of formation of the various types, and generally accepted preventive measures are not as yet known. This publication is intended to promote uniform terminology, inspection, and reporting.

##### 1. INTRODUCTION

Because of its ability to record a large amount of information in a small space and its stability relative to most record materials, photographic film is one of the most common media for the storage of records. A considerable percentage of U.S. Government records are stored on microfilm. Even though such films have been prepared by the best known techniques and stored in the best known manner, the only assurance that such records are being well maintained is a systematic program of careful inspection. Improper processing or storage conditions have long been known to promote general fading and various kinds of biological attack. Inspections of large numbers of rolls of microfilm recently have revealed several kinds of blemishes not heretofore noted. It appears that they have developed from 2 to 20 years after the film was processed and placed in storage. The blemishes have been classified on the basis of size, shape, color, and character. The purpose of this publication is to name and describe the various blemishes, to provide illustrations of them, to describe the method of observing them, and to recommend sampling procedures for microfilm inspectors. Although the chemistry and physics of these blemishes are under investigation at the National Bureau of Standards and in research laboratories in the photographic industry, the causes of the blemishes, the exact mechanisms of their formation, and generally accepted preventive measures have not

yet been established. A vital part of the research program is accurate reporting of blemishes, so that the incidence of the various types can be correlated with processing and storage variables. In this stage of the investigation, it cannot be expected that the types of blemishes described necessarily exhaust the possibilities, nor can the types be regarded as necessarily mutually exclusive.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could reproduce colored photographs so that my distinguished colleagues could see the spots and blemishes for themselves.

There is no question in my mind that important Government records could be irreparably damaged if present methods of preservation are continued.

Every effort must be made to substitute cotton fiber paper so that a serious loss of information does not occur in the future.

Why do I say cotton fiber paper?

The answer is, of course, obvious. It is perhaps the only possible solution to the problem. In grammar as in life, there is often one alternative and I think the alternative in this case is fine, durable paper which would last for centuries. This, Mr. Speaker, is not a vague plea for a certain interest. I need not repeat the case for cotton fiber paper, which has played a powerful role in preserving our records. It is both permanent and perfect. It has stood the test of time.

The issue here is a basic one. Should the Government continue to put its records on microfilm when the consequences of that action could prove disastrous?

I believe that an immediate investigation is necessary. The records of this Nation are far too important to warrant anything but the most careful precautions.

Accordingly, I will take appropriate steps to set this investigation in motion.

My resolution, introduced today, and viewed in a favorable light by other Members of the House, is hereby noted in full:

Whereas the National Bureau of Standards in its Handbook 96 entitled "Inspection of Processed Photographic Record Film for Aging Blemishes" has discovered certain blemishes on some microfilm records processed and placed in storage; and

Whereas a considerable portion of all Government records are today being placed on microfilm; and

Whereas Government records may not be as safe from deterioration as assumed, and there may be a significant danger in consigning records to microfilm or any other recordkeeping material that has not proven itself to be permanent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House that the Administrator of General Services and all officers of the Federal Government having responsibility of permanent Government records should investigate the permanence of all recordkeeping materials now being used, including but not limited to microfilm, for the purpose of insuring that those records of the Federal Government which should be permanently retained will be stored on recordkeeping material which has proven itself to be of a permanent nature, such as 100 percent cotton fiber paper.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to continue to pursue this matter in an effort to insure that all future recordkeeping of this Nation be such that its permanency be established for all time. I welcome the



support of all individuals interested in the future flow of information to join with me in this fight. The poet, Carl Sandburg has said the "best witness is a written paper." Our records must be preserved on paper that will insure, for all time, their stature as documents and records of our way of life.

# PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1794)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 8, 12, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to

the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,194,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$939,943,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$77,862,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,404,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,054,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$185,616,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,261,573,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
JOHN R. PILLION,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
LISTER HILL,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON (except for amendment No. 2),  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
PAT MCNAMARA,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

### Corps of Engineers—Civil

#### General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$22,194,000 instead of \$20,590,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,269,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

| Item                                                                                      | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 | Conference allowance | Item                                                                             | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 | Conference allowance |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS                                                                    |                                               |                      | GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—continued                                                 |                                               |                      |
| 1. Surveys:                                                                               |                                               |                      | 1. Surveys—Continued                                                             |                                               |                      |
| (a) Navigation studies.....                                                               | \$2,257,000                                   | \$3,135,000          | (e) Special Studies—Continued                                                    |                                               |                      |
| (b) Flood control studies.....                                                            | 5,835,000                                     | 7,091,000            | Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J.....                                                | \$150,000                                     | \$150,000            |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperatives studies.....                                               | 458,000                                       | 523,000              | Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.....                                             | 200,000                                       | 200,000              |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies:                                                          |                                               |                      | Texas coast.....                                                                 | 250,000                                       | 250,000              |
| Big Black River, Miss.....                                                                | 65,000                                        | 65,000               | Subtotal, surveys.....                                                           | 14,035,000                                    | 16,634,000           |
| Big Muddy River, Ill.....                                                                 | 125,000                                       | 125,000              |                                                                                  |                                               |                      |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H.....                                  | 275,000                                       | 275,000              | 2. Collection and study of basic data:                                           |                                               |                      |
| Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.....                                                    | 130,000                                       | 130,000              | Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....                                      | 280,000                                       | 280,000              |
| Grand River Basin, Mich.....                                                              | 175,000                                       | 175,000              | Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....                                 | 480,000                                       | 480,000              |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C.....                                                  | 250,000                                       | 250,000              | Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)..... | 210,000                                       | 210,000              |
| Missouri River Basin.....                                                                 | 250,000                                       | 250,000              | International water studies.....                                                 | 85,000                                        | 85,000               |
| Ohio River Basin review.....                                                              | 375,000                                       | 375,000              | Food plain studies.....                                                          | 725,000                                       | 725,000              |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.....                                                         | 125,000                                       | 200,000              | Subtotal, collection and study of basic data.....                                | 1,780,000                                     | 1,780,000            |
| Pearl River Basin, Miss.....                                                              | 125,000                                       | 125,000              |                                                                                  |                                               |                      |
| Puget Sound area, Washington.....                                                         | 275,000                                       | 275,000              | 3. Research and development:                                                     |                                               |                      |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.....                               | 300,000                                       | 300,000              | Coastal engineering research and development.....                                | 850,000                                       | 850,000              |
| Sabin River, Tex.....                                                                     | 130,000                                       | 130,000              | Hydrologic studies.....                                                          | 190,000                                       | 190,000              |
| St. Johns River Basin, Maine.....                                                         | 75,000                                        | 75,000               | Civil works investigations.....                                                  | 1,500,000                                     | 1,500,000            |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md.....                                           | 400,000                                       | 400,000              | Mississippi Basin model:                                                         |                                               |                      |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin.....                                                        | 350,000                                       | 350,000              | Mississippi River comprehensive study.....                                       | 210,000                                       | 210,000              |
| Wabash River, Ind. and Ill.....                                                           | 425,000                                       | 550,000              | Maintenance.....                                                                 | 150,000                                       | 150,000              |
| White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.....                                                       | 300,000                                       | 300,000              | Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.....                           | 1,080,000                                     | 1,080,000            |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg.....                                                         | 350,000                                       | 350,000              | Subtotal, research and development.....                                          | 3,980,000                                     | 3,980,000            |
| (e) Special studies:                                                                      |                                               |                      | General reduction due to slippage.....                                           |                                               | -200,000             |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana..... | 125,000                                       | 125,000              | Total, general investigations.....                                               | 19,795,000                                    | 22,194,000           |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.).....      | 260,000                                       | 260,000              |                                                                                  |                                               |                      |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.....                                               | 200,000                                       | 200,000              |                                                                                  |                                               |                      |



Within the amount provided above the House figure \$56,000 is for the coast of Hawaiian Island study. The \$75,000 budgeted for the Nenana River, Alaska study has been deleted. The conferees of both Houses are

in agreement on the Senate Report statement on comprehensive river basin studies.

#### Construction, General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$939,943,200 instead of \$905,767,200 as proposed by the

House and \$942,791,200 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                 | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | Conferees allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
|                                          |                                                                                                                 | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction        | Planning  |
| <b>ALABAMA</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Claiborne lock and dam                                                                                          | \$1,000,000                                       |           | \$1,000,000         |           |
| (N)                                      | Holt lock and dam                                                                                               | 8,000,000                                         |           | 8,000,000           |           |
| (NP)                                     | Jones Bluff lock and dam                                                                                        |                                                   | \$134,000 |                     | \$134,000 |
| (MP)                                     | Millers Ferry lock and dam                                                                                      | 6,000,000                                         |           | 6,000,000           |           |
| (N)                                      | Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel                                                                                   | 1,500,000                                         |           | 2,476,000           |           |
| (N)                                      | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.                                                                    |                                                   | 100,000   |                     | 100,000   |
| (N)                                      | West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)                                                                     |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| <b>ALASKA</b>                            |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Repairs on other navigation projects in Alaska                                                                  |                                                   |           | 500,000             |           |
| (MP)                                     | Snettisham power project                                                                                        |                                                   | 750,000   |                     | 750,000   |
| <b>ARIZONA</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Alamo Reservoir                                                                                                 | 2,500,000                                         |           | 2,500,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir                                                               |                                                   | 251,000   |                     | 251,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Pinal Creek                                                                                                     |                                                   | 55,000    |                     | 55,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Tucson diversion channel                                                                                        | 2,400,000                                         |           | 2,400,000           |           |
| <b>ARKANSAS</b>                          |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:                                                          |                                                   |           |                     |           |
|                                          | (a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification                                                                | 15,000,000                                        |           | 15,000,000          |           |
|                                          | (b) Navigation locks and dams                                                                                   | 51,500,000                                        |           | 51,500,000          |           |
| (MP)                                     | Beaver Reservoir                                                                                                | 4,500,000                                         |           | 4,500,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Dardanelle lock and dam                                                                                         | 10,000,000                                        |           | 10,000,000          |           |
| (FC)                                     | De Queen Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                   | 245,000   |                     | 245,000   |
| (MP)                                     | De Gray Reservoir                                                                                               | 7,100,000                                         |           | 7,100,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Dierks Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                   | 150,000   |                     | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Garland City                                                                                                    | 250,000                                           |           | 250,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Gillham Reservoir                                                                                               | 2,500,000                                         |           | 2,500,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Maniece Bayou, upstream extension                                                                               | 100,000                                           |           | 100,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Millwood Reservoir                                                                                              | 17,697,000                                        |           | 17,697,000          |           |
| (MP)                                     | Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit                                                                          | 350,000                                           |           | 350,000             |           |
| (N)                                      | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.                                                                         | 3,000,000                                         |           | 3,000,000           |           |
| (N)                                      | Ozark lock and dam                                                                                              | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.                                  | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts                                                        |                                                   | 87,000    |                     | 87,000    |
| <b>CALIFORNIA</b>                        |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam                                                                                    | 750,000                                           |           | 750,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Bear Creek                                                                                                      | 900,000                                           |           | 900,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Buchanan Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                   | 200,000   |                     | 200,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Camanche Reservoir                                                                                              | 3,350,000                                         |           | 3,350,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Corte Madera Creek                                                                                              |                                                   | 100,000   |                     | 100,000   |
| (N)                                      | Dana Point Harbor                                                                                               |                                                   | 100,000   |                     | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement                                                      |                                                   | 450,000   |                     | 450,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Hidden Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                   | 250,000   |                     | 250,000   |
| (BE)                                     | Imperial Beach (reimbursement)                                                                                  | 26,000                                            |           | 26,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Los Angeles County drainage area                                                                                | 15,000,000                                        |           | 15,000,000          |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries                                                                         | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000           |           |
| (N)                                      | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor                                                                                   | 600,000                                           |           | 600,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)                                                           |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Merced River Reservoirs                                                                                         |                                                   | 50,000    |                     | 200,000   |
| (N)                                      | Monterey Harbor                                                                                                 |                                                   | 90,000    |                     | 90,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Mormon Slough                                                                                                   |                                                   | 75,000    |                     | 75,000    |
| (MP)                                     | New Melones Reservoir                                                                                           |                                                   | 450,000   |                     | 700,000   |
| (N)                                      | Oakland Inner Harbor                                                                                            |                                                   |           |                     | 110,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Oroville Reservoir                                                                                              | 9,000,000                                         |           | 8,390,000           |           |
| (BE)                                     | Point Mugu to San Pedro (reimbursement)                                                                         | 196,000                                           |           | 196,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Redwood Creek                                                                                                   |                                                   | 125,000   |                     | 125,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Sacramento River bank protection                                                                                | 1,150,000                                         |           | 1,250,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries                                                                | 1,530,000                                         |           | 1,530,000           |           |
| (N)                                      | Sacramento River deep water ship channel                                                                        | 350,000                                           |           | 350,000             |           |
| (N)                                      | Santa Barbara Harbor                                                                                            |                                                   |           |                     | 150,000   |
| (N)                                      | Santa Cruz Harbor                                                                                               | 105,000                                           |           | 105,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Tahchevah Creek                                                                                                 | 830,000                                           |           | 1,160,000           |           |
| (BE)                                     | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)                                                                           | 224,000                                           |           | 224,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Walnut Creek                                                                                                    | 1,810,000                                         |           | 1,810,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | West Fork Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                   | 207,000   |                     | 207,000   |
| <b>COLORADO</b>                          |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Trinidad Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                   |           | 750,000             |           |
| <b>CONNECTICUT</b>                       |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Ansonia-Derby                                                                                                   |                                                   | 175,000   |                     | 175,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Black Rock Reservoir                                                                                            |                                                   | 50,000    |                     | 50,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Colebrook River Reservoir                                                                                       | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000             |           |
| (N)                                      | Connecticut River below Hartford—North Cove                                                                     |                                                   |           | 578,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Hancock Brook Reservoir                                                                                         | 1,279,000                                         |           | 1,279,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Hop Brook Reservoir                                                                                             | 400,000                                           |           | 400,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | New London Barrier                                                                                              |                                                   | 100,000   |                     | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Northfield Brook Reservoir                                                                                      | 1,346,000                                         |           | 1,346,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Stamford                                                                                                        | 1,700,000                                         |           | 1,700,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                         | 2,300,000                                         |           | 2,300,000           |           |
| <b>DELAWARE</b>                          |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                     |           |
|                                          | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)      |                                                   |           |                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | 11,500,000                                        |           | 11,500,000          |           |
| (BE)                                     | Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)                                                            | 110,000                                           |           | 110,000             |           |

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                                                                                          | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance                |           |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
|                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                          | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction                        | Planning  |
| <b>FLORIDA</b>                           |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                                                                                                  |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Apalachicola River channel improvement                                                                                                                                                   | \$100,000                                         |           | \$100,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Canaveral Harbor                                                                                                                                                                         | 3,900,000                                         |           | 3,900,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Central and southern Florida                                                                                                                                                             | 13,800,000                                        |           | 14,150,000                          |           |
| (N)                                      | Cross Florida Barge Canal                                                                                                                                                                | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Four River Basins                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                   | \$200,000 |                                     | \$200,000 |
| (N)                                      | Intracoastal Waterway: (a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River                                                                                                                         | 700,000                                           |           | 850,000                             |           |
| (N)                                      | Miami Harbor                                                                                                                                                                             | 1,076,000                                         |           | 1,076,000                           |           |
| (BE)                                     | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)                                                                                                            | 10,000                                            |           | 10,000                              |           |
| (N)                                      | Palm Beach Harbor                                                                                                                                                                        | 1,300,000                                         |           | 1,300,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Pensacola Harbor                                                                                                                                                                         | 300,000                                           |           | 550,000                             |           |
| (N)                                      | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)                                                                                                                                                        | 1,254,000                                         |           | 1,254,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channel                                                                                                                                               | 150,000                                           |           | 150,000                             |           |
| <b>GEORGIA</b>                           |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                                                                                                  |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (MP)                                     | Carters Dam                                                                                                                                                                              | 6,000,000                                         |           | 6,000,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin                                                                                                                                              | 340,000                                           |           | 340,000                             |           |
| (MP)                                     | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.                                                                                                                                                       |                                                   | 500,000   |                                     | 500,000   |
| <b>HAWAII</b>                            |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Nawiliwili Harbor (sec. 107)                                                                                                                                                             |                                                   |           | (144,000)                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Hilo Harbor                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                   | 550,000   |                                     | 550,000   |
| (R)                                      | Kahului Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                                                                                              | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Kawainui Swamp                                                                                                                                                                           | 700,000                                           |           | 700,000                             |           |
| <b>IDAHO</b>                             |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Blackfoot Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                   | 46,000    |                                     | 46,000    |
| (MP)                                     | Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir                                                                                                                                                         | 8,500,000                                         |           | 8,500,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Helse-Roberts Extension                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                   | 70,000    |                                     | 70,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Ririe Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     | 400,000   |
| <b>ILLINOIS</b>                          |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (BA)                                     | Calumet River, bridges                                                                                                                                                                   | 1,300,000                                         |           | 1,300,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:<br>(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)<br>(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor                         | 1,500,000<br>2,500,000<br>7,200,000               |           | 2,500,000<br>2,500,000<br>7,200,000 |           |
| (FC)                                     | Carlyle Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                        | 7,200,000                                         |           | 7,200,000                           |           |
| (R)                                      | Chicago Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                                                                                              | 700,000                                           |           | 700,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | East St. Louis and vicinity                                                                                                                                                              | 400,000                                           |           | 400,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | England Pond levee                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                   |           |                                     | 30,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Freeport                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                   | 125,000   |                                     | 125,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 1                                                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           | 100,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 2                                                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           | 100,000                             |           |
| (N)                                      | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana                                                                                                                 | 5,000,000                                         |           | 5,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Indian Grove Drainage District                                                                                                                                                           |                                                   | 96,000    |                                     | 96,000    |
| (N)                                      | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)                                                                                                                                       |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (N)                                      | Kaskaskia River                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   | 400,000   |                                     | 400,000   |
| (FC)                                     | McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District                                                                                                                                                  |                                                   | 140,000   |                                     | 140,000   |
| (N)                                      | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:<br>(a) Regulating works<br>(b) Chain of Rocks                                                                          | 2,000,000<br>1,300,000<br>700,000                 |           | 2,000,000<br>1,300,000<br>700,000   |           |
| (FC)                                     | Mount Carmel                                                                                                                                                                             | 120,000                                           |           | 120,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | New Athens                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Oakley Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                   | 275,000   |                                     | 275,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Prairie Du Pont Levee and Sanitary District                                                                                                                                              |                                                   |           |                                     | 47,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Rend Lake Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                      | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Richland Creek                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                   | 200,000   |                                     | 200,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee                                                                                                                                                      | 750,000                                           |           | 750,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Saline River and tributaries                                                                                                                                                             |                                                   | 75,000    |                                     | 75,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Shelbyville Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                    | 2,800,000                                         |           | 2,800,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Sny Island Levee Drainage District                                                                                                                                                       |                                                   |           | 400,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District                                                                                                     | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | The Sny Basin                                                                                                                                                                            | 1,700,000                                         |           | 1,700,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Tri-pond levee                                                                                                                                                                           | 470,060                                           |           | 470,000                             |           |
| <b>INDIANA</b>                           |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Brookville Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                   | 165,000   | 665,000                             |           |
| (N)                                      | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)                                                                                                                                  |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                                                                                            | 11,600,000                                        |           | 11,600,000                          |           |
| (FC)                                     | Evansville                                                                                                                                                                               | 900,000                                           |           | 900,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Huntington Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                     | 2,800,000                                         |           | 2,800,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)                                                                                                |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois                                                                                                                                                       |                                                   | 38,000    |                                     | 38,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Levee unit 5, Wabash River                                                                                                                                                               | 1,500,000                                         |           | 1,500,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Mason J. Niblack levee                                                                                                                                                                   | 170,000                                           |           | 170,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)                                                                                                                             |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Mississinewa Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                   | 6,000,000                                         |           | 6,000,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Monroe Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                         | 1,649,000                                         |           | 1,649,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                                                                                             |                                                   | 110,000   | 2,100,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Salamonie Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                      | 5,500,000                                         |           | 5,500,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                                                                                            | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000                           |           |
| <b>IOWA</b>                              |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                   |           |                                     |           |
| (FC)                                     | Central City Reservoir (restudy)                                                                                                                                                         |                                                   |           |                                     | 60,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge                                                                                                                                                    | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Des Moines                                                                                                                                                                               | 200,000                                           |           | 200,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Duquaque                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                   | 100,000   |                                     | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Floyd River and tributaries                                                                                                                                                              | 3,221,000                                         |           | 3,299,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Green Bay Levee Drainage District No. 2                                                                                                                                                  | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Indian Creek Dam                                                                                                                                                                         | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000                             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16                                                                                                                                             | 1,500,000                                         |           | 1,500,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska                                                                                                                 | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000                           |           |
| (N)                                      | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:<br>(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.<br>(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City<br>(c) Kansas City to the mouth | 3,500,000<br>2,700,000<br>3,500,000               |           | 4,500,000<br>4,800,000<br>3,500,000 |           |
| (FC)                                     | Rathbun Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                        | 1,750,000                                         |           | 1,750,000                           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Red Rock Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                       | 16,500,000                                        |           | 16,500,000                          |           |
| (FC)                                     | Saylorville Reservoir                                                                                                                                                                    | 1,200,000                                         |           | 1,200,000                           |           |



| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                     | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                          |                                                                                                                     | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| <b>KANSAS</b>                            |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Atehlson                                                                                                            |                                                   | \$160,000 |                      | \$160,000 |
| (FC)                                     | Big Hill Reservoir                                                                                                  |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Clinton Reservoir                                                                                                   |                                                   | 240,000   |                      | 240,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Council Grove Reservoir                                                                                             | \$688,000                                         |           | \$688,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Elk City Reservoir                                                                                                  | 7,500,000                                         |           | 7,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Fort Scott Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                   |           |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir                                                                                     | 1,288,000                                         |           | 1,288,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)                                                                              |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Lawrence                                                                                                            | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Marion Reservoir                                                                                                    | 2,700,000                                         |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Marysville                                                                                                          |                                                   |           | 200,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Melvorn Reservoir                                                                                                   |                                                   | 230,000   |                      | 230,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Merriam                                                                                                             |                                                   | 40,000    |                      | 40,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Millford Reservoir                                                                                                  | 16,000,000                                        |           | 16,000,000           |           |
|                                          | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                               |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                             |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Perry Reservoir                                                                                                     | 8,500,000                                         |           | 8,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Topeka                                                                                                              | 4,500,000                                         |           | 4,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Wilson Reservoir                                                                                                    | 2,900,000                                         |           | 2,900,000            |           |
| <b>KENTUCKY</b>                          |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                     | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.                                                                                          | 15,400,000                                        |           | 15,400,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Bellvue (deferred) and Dayton (inactive)                                                                            |                                                   |           |                      | 25,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Booneville Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
|                                          | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                       |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio                                                            | 6,365,000                                         |           | 6,365,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Carr Fork Reservoir                                                                                                 | 830,000                                           |           | 830,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Cave Run Reservoir                                                                                                  | 1,300,000                                         |           | 1,300,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Cumberland                                                                                                          | 490,000                                           |           | 490,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Eagle Creek Reservoir                                                                                               |                                                   | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Fishtrap Reservoir                                                                                                  | 10,400,000                                        |           | 18,000,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Frankfort                                                                                                           |                                                   | 130,000   |                      | 130,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Grayson Reservoir                                                                                                   | 4,200,000                                         |           | 4,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Green River Reservoir                                                                                               | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Laurel River Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                   |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky                                                           | 2,800,000                                         |           | 2,800,000            |           |
|                                          | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                        |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Red River Reservoir                                                                                                 |                                                   | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Sturgis floodwall                                                                                                   |                                                   |           |                      | 75,000    |
|                                          | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)                                                       |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| <b>LOUISIANA</b>                         |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway                                                                         | 800,000                                           |           | 800,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Calcasieu River and Pass                                                                                            | 4,000,000                                         |           | 5,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Calcasieu River, salt-water barrier                                                                                 | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Campiti Clarence levee                                                                                              | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Comite (See 205)                                                                                                    |                                                   |           | (1,000,000)          |           |
| (N)                                      | Freshwater Bayou                                                                                                    | 1,400,000                                         |           | 1,400,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Mississippi River, gulf outlet                                                                                      | 8,750,000                                         |           | 9,250,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)                                                               | 750,000                                           |           | 750,000              |           |
|                                          | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)                                                             |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)                      |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| <b>MAINE</b>                             |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel                                                                                    | 1,700,000                                         |           | 1,850,000            |           |
|                                          | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)                                         |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| <b>MARYLAND</b>                          |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Baltimore Harbor and Channel                                                                                        | 3,300,000                                         |           | 3,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.                                                                               |                                                   | 350,000   |                      | 350,000   |
|                                          | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.)           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| <b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>                     |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Boston Harbor, Chelsea River                                                                                        | 550,000                                           |           | 550,000              |           |
| (R)                                      | Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge                                                                                       | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Chicopee Falls                                                                                                      | 620,000                                           |           | 620,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Conant Brook Reservoir                                                                                              | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Gloucester Harbor                                                                                                   | 830,000                                           |           | 830,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Littleville Reservoir                                                                                               | 1,936,000                                         |           | 1,936,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Marblehead Harbor                                                                                                   |                                                   |           |                      | 50,000    |
| (FC)                                     | New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet barrier                                                                          | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Three Rivers                                                                                                        | 435,000                                           |           | 435,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Wareham-Marion                                                                                                      |                                                   | 75,000    |                      | 75,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Westfield                                                                                                           | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000              |           |
| <b>MICHIGAN</b>                          |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (R)                                      | Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)                                                                            | 150,000                                           |           | 150,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Gladstone Harbor                                                                                                    | 617,000                                           |           | 617,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Great Lakes connecting channels                                                                                     | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Leland Harbor                                                                                                       |                                                   |           |                      | 30,000    |
| (R)                                      | Ludington Harbor (north revetment)                                                                                  | 172,000                                           |           | 172,000              |           |
| (R)                                      | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)                                                                                | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |           |
| (R)                                      | Marquette Harbor                                                                                                    | 150,000                                           |           | 150,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Muskegon Harbor                                                                                                     | 560,000                                           |           | 560,000              |           |
| (R)                                      | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)                                                                | 150,000                                           |           | 150,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | New Buffalo Harbor                                                                                                  |                                                   |           |                      | 50,000    |
| (N)                                      | Ontonagon Harbor                                                                                                    |                                                   | 91,000    |                      | 91,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Rouge River                                                                                                         |                                                   | 178,000   |                      | 400,000   |
| (N)                                      | St. Marys River: New Poc lock                                                                                       | 5,500,000                                         |           | 5,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Saginaw River (flood control)                                                                                       | 750,000                                           |           | 750,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Saginaw River (navigation)                                                                                          |                                                   | 120,000   |                      | 120,000   |
| <b>MINNESOTA</b>                         |                                                                                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: Inner harbor, 27- and 23-foot channels                                      | 675,000                                           |           | 675,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lost River                                                                                                          | 250,000                                           |           | 250,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Minnesota River, 9-foot channel                                                                                     | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (R)                                      | Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)                   | 235,000                                           |           | 235,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Rushford                                                                                                            |                                                   | 80,000    |                      | 80,000    |
| (FC)                                     | St. Paul and South St. Paul                                                                                         | 600,000                                           |           | 600,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Winona                                                                                                              | 800,000                                           |           | 800,000              |           |



| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                           | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                          |                                                                                           | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| MISSISSIPPI                              |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                   |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Jackson and East Jackson                                                                  |                                                   |           | \$800,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir                                                                 | \$500,000                                         |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Pascagoula Harbor                                                                         | 620,000                                           |           | 620,000              |           |
|                                          | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)                               |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi                                  |                                                   |           | 400,000              |           |
| MISSOURI                                 |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Chariton River                                                                            | 650,000                                           |           | 650,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Hannibal                                                                                  |                                                   | \$155,000 |                      | \$155,000 |
| (MP)                                     | Joanna Reservoir                                                                          |                                                   | 434,000   |                      | 434,000   |
| (MP)                                     | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir                                                                 | 1,500,000                                         |           | 1,500,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction                                           | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Marion County Drainage District                                                           | 764,000                                           |           | 764,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Meramec Park Reservoir                                                                    |                                                   |           |                      | 200,000   |
|                                          | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)          |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)      |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)   |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3                                     | 596,000                                           |           | 596,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | South River Drainage District                                                             | 499,000                                           |           | 499,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | St. Louis                                                                                 | 10,000,000                                        |           | 10,000,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Stockton Reservoir                                                                        | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000            |           |
| MONTANA                                  |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Billings (deferred)                                                                       |                                                   |           |                      | 25,000    |
| (MP)                                     | Libby Reservoir                                                                           |                                                   | 1,000,000 |                      | 1,000,000 |
| NEBRASKA                                 |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Gering Valley                                                                             | 1,400,000                                         |           | 1,400,000            |           |
| (R)                                      | Harlan County Reservoir (slope protection)                                                | 1,600,000                                         |           | 1,600,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Little Papillion Creek                                                                    |                                                   |           | 80,000               |           |
|                                          | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)     |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)   |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Norfolk                                                                                   | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Salt Creek and tributaries                                                                | 3,000,000                                         |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| NEVADA                                   |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.                                                   |                                                   | 125,000   |                      | 200,000   |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE                            |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (BE)                                     | Hampton Beach erosion (reimbursement)                                                     |                                                   |           | 109,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.                                    | 1,500,000                                         |           | 1,500,000            |           |
| NEW JERSEY                               |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (R)                                      | Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)                                                               | 488,000                                           |           | 488,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchors), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania     | 3,750,000                                         |           | 3,750,000            |           |
| (R)                                      | Manasquan River (bulkheads)                                                               | 90,000                                            |           | 90,000               |           |
| (N)                                      | Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel                            | 1,132,000                                         |           | 1,132,000            |           |
| (R)                                      | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey          | 264,000                                           |           | 264,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Rahway (sec. 205)                                                                         |                                                   |           | (544,000)            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays                                                               | 1,100,000                                         |           | 1,100,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.                                                      |                                                   | 450,000   |                      | 450,000   |
| NEW MEXICO                               |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Albuquerque                                                                               | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Cochiti Reservoir                                                                         |                                                   |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Galisteo Reservoir                                                                        |                                                   |           | 2,300,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Las Cruces                                                                                |                                                   | 192,000   |                      | 192,000   |
| NEW YORK                                 |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)                               |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Buffalo Harbor: Outer harbor—(1962 modification)                                          | 1,406,000                                         |           | 1,406,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Buttermilk Channel                                                                        | 1,300,000                                         |           | 1,300,000            |           |
| (BE)                                     | Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)                                               |                                                   |           |                      | 25,000    |
| (BE)                                     | Fire Island Inlet, Long Island                                                            | 1,112,000                                         |           | 1,112,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point                                                        | 1,900,000                                         |           | 1,900,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway                                                      | 400,000                                           |           | 400,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Hudson River, New York City to Albany                                                     | 3,200,000                                         |           | 3,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet                                                                      | 800,000                                           |           | 800,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lackawanna                                                                                | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lake Chautauqua and Chautauque River                                                      |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (R)                                      | Little Sodus Bay (piers)                                                                  | 215,000                                           |           | 215,000              |           |
|                                          | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Nichols                                                                                   |                                                   | 35,000    |                      | 35,000    |
| (FC)                                     | North Ellenville                                                                          |                                                   |           |                      | 50,000    |
| (N)                                      | Oswego Harbor (1962 act)                                                                  | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Rosendale                                                                                 |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Salamanca                                                                                 |                                                   | 75,000    |                      | 75,000    |
| (FC)                                     | South Amsterdam                                                                           | 378,000                                           |           | 378,000              |           |
| NORTH CAROLINA                           |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                   |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection                                                | 300,000                                           |           | 678,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Masonboro Inlet jetties                                                                   |                                                   |           | 150,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | New Hope Reservoir                                                                        |                                                   | 250,000   |                      | 250,000   |
| (N)                                      | Northeast Cape Fear (sec. 107)                                                            |                                                   |           | (105,200)            |           |
| (N)                                      | Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)                                       |                                                   | 67,000    |                      | 67,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Wrightsville Beach                                                                        |                                                   |           | 541,000              |           |
| NORTH DAKOTA                             |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Bowman Haley Reservoir                                                                    | 800,000                                           |           | 1,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir                                            | 800,000                                           |           | 800,000              |           |
|                                          | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)                                   |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Velva (sec. 205)                                                                          |                                                   |           | (214,000)            |           |
| OHIO                                     |                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                                          | 16,500,000                                        |           | 16,500,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Big Darby Creek Reservoir                                                                 | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Buck Creek Reservoir                                                                      |                                                   | 77,000    |                      | 730,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Caesar Creek Reservoir                                                                    |                                                   | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
|                                          | Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)                 |                                                   |           |                      |           |

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                 | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |           | Conference allowance |                       |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|
|                                          |                                                                                                                 | Construction                                      | Planning  | Construction         | Planning <sup>9</sup> |
| OHIO—continued                           |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (N)                                      | Cleveland Harbor (1962 act).....                                                                                |                                                   |           | \$500,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyaboga and Old Rivers (1958 act).....                          | \$1,800,000                                       |           | 1,800,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Conneaut Harbor.....                                                                                            | 1,000,000                                         |           | 1,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Deer Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   |           | 500,000              |                       |
| (FC)                                     | East Fork Reservoir.....                                                                                        |                                                   | \$150,000 |                      | \$150,000             |
| (FC)                                     | Empire (restudy).....                                                                                           |                                                   |           |                      | 25,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Fremont.....                                                                                                    |                                                   | 130,000   |                      | 130,000               |
| (N)                                      | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                                             |                                                   | 230,000   |                      | 230,000               |
| (N)                                      | Lorain Harbor.....                                                                                              | 3,000,000                                         |           | 3,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir.....                                                                      |                                                   | 99,000    |                      | 99,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Paint Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                      |                                                   | 116,000   |                      | 116,000               |
| (N)                                      | Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                                          | 7,539,000                                         |           | 7,539,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                                               | 6,200,000                                         |           | 6,200,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Salt Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   | 200,000   |                      | 200,000               |
|                                          | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.).....                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River.....                                                                      | 4,100,000                                         |           | 4,100,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....                                                         |                                                   | 325,000   |                      | 325,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Youngstown, Crab Creek.....                                                                                     |                                                   | 25,000    |                      | 25,000                |
| OKLAHOMA                                 |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
|                                          | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.).....                                     |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Birch Reservoir.....                                                                                            |                                                   | 155,000   |                      | 155,000               |
| (MP)                                     | Broken Bow Reservoir.....                                                                                       | 4,800,000                                         |           | 4,800,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Copan Reservoir.....                                                                                            |                                                   | 150,000   |                      | 150,000               |
| (MP)                                     | Eufaula Reservoir.....                                                                                          | 3,000,000                                         |           | 3,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Hugo Reservoir.....                                                                                             |                                                   | 150,000   |                      | 150,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Kaw Reservoir.....                                                                                              |                                                   | 200,000   |                      | 200,000               |
| (MP)                                     | Keystone Reservoir.....                                                                                         | 6,000,000                                         |           | 6,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Lukfata Reservoir.....                                                                                          |                                                   | 25,000    |                      | 25,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Optima Reservoir.....                                                                                           |                                                   | 162,000   |                      | 162,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Pine Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                       | 3,500,000                                         |           | 3,500,000            |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam.....                                                               | 9,000,000                                         |           | 9,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Skiatook Reservoir.....                                                                                         |                                                   | 225,000   |                      | 225,000               |
| (N)                                      | Webbers Falls lock and dam.....                                                                                 | 2,500,000                                         |           | 2,500,000            |                       |
| OREGON                                   |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Applegate Reservoir.....                                                                                        |                                                   |           |                      | 150,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Blue River Reservoir.....                                                                                       | 2,028,000                                         |           | 2,028,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects Oregon and Washington.....                  | 2,000,000                                         |           | 2,500,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.....                                                         |                                                   | 130,000   |                      | 130,000               |
| (R)                                      | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington.....                                           | 1,500,000                                         |           | 1,500,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Coos and Millicoma Rivers.....                                                                                  | 555,000                                           |           | 555,000              |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Cougar Reservoir.....                                                                                           | 585,000                                           |           | 585,000              |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Elk Creek.....                                                                                                  |                                                   |           |                      | 130,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Fall Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                       | 8,500,000                                         |           | 8,500,000            |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Green Peter Reservoir.....                                                                                      | 19,500,000                                        |           | 19,500,000           |                       |
| (MP)                                     | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.....                                                               | 72,000,000                                        |           | 72,000,000           |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Lost Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   | 350,000   |                      | 350,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington.....                                                | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Shelton Ditch.....                                                                                              |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000               |
| (R)                                      | Tillamook Bay and Harbor.....                                                                                   | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Willamette River Basin bank protection.....                                                                     | 500,000                                           |           | 500,000              |                       |
| (N)                                      | Yaquina Bay and Harbor.....                                                                                     | 1,700,000                                         |           | 1,700,000            |                       |
| PENNSYLVANIA                             |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.....                                                                     | 27,000,000                                        |           | 27,000,000           |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Aylesworth Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                 |                                                   | 80,000    |                      | 80,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Beitzville Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   | 276,000   |                      | 276,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Blanchard Reservoir.....                                                                                        |                                                   |           | 1,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Blue Marsh Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Butler.....                                                                                                     | 762,000                                           |           | 762,000              |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Curwensville Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 3,200,000                                         |           | 3,200,000            |                       |
| (N)                                      | Dam 4, Monongahela River.....                                                                                   | 3,800,000                                         |           | 3,800,000            |                       |
|                                          | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)..... |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Eikland.....                                                                                                    | 800,000                                           |           | 800,000              |                       |
| (N)                                      | Erie Harbor (1962 modification).....                                                                            |                                                   |           |                      | 25,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Latrobe.....                                                                                                    | 300,000                                           |           | 300,000              |                       |
| (N)                                      | Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River.....                                                                   | 5,500,000                                         |           | 5,500,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Muddy Creek Reservoir.....                                                                                      |                                                   | 25,000    |                      | 25,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Raystown Reservoir.....                                                                                         |                                                   | 700,000   |                      | 700,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Scranton.....                                                                                                   |                                                   | 45,000    |                      | 45,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.....                                                                      | 11,300,000                                        |           | 11,300,000           |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Tioga-Hammond Reservoir.....                                                                                    |                                                   | 300,000   |                      | 300,000               |
|                                          | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.).....                                                     |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Turtle Creek.....                                                                                               | 4,500,000                                         |           | 4,500,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Union City Reservoir.....                                                                                       |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 100,000               |
| (FC)                                     | Woodcock Reservoir.....                                                                                         |                                                   | 60,000    |                      | 60,000                |
| RHODE ISLAND                             |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Fox Point Barrier.....                                                                                          | 1,857,000                                         |           | 1,857,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Lower Woonsocket.....                                                                                           | 2,000,000                                         |           | 2,000,000            |                       |
| (FC)                                     | Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier.....                                                                        |                                                   | 65,000    |                      | 65,000                |
| (FC)                                     | Point Judith—Hurricane barrier.....                                                                             |                                                   | 100,000   |                      | 120,000               |
| (N)                                      | Warwick Cove (sec. 107).....                                                                                    |                                                   |           | (200,000)            |                       |
| SOUTH CAROLINA                           |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.).....                                                                    |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| SOUTH DAKOTA                             |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Big Bend Reservoir.....                                                                                         | 14,500,000                                        |           | 14,500,000           |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Fort Randall Reservoir.....                                                                                     | 1,270,000                                         |           | 1,270,000            |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.....                                                                         | 4,000,000                                         |           | 4,000,000            |                       |
| TENNESSEE                                |                                                                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
|                                          | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.).....                                                                 |                                                   |           |                      |                       |
| (MP)                                     | Cordell Hull lock and dam.....                                                                                  | 7,100,000                                         |           | 8,100,000            |                       |
| (MP)                                     | J. Percy Priest Reservoir.....                                                                                  | 12,100,000                                        |           | 12,100,000           |                       |
| (BA)                                     | Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.....                                                                    | 413,000                                           |           | 413,000              |                       |



| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                           | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |            | Conference allowance         |            |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|------------|
|                                          |                                                                                                           | Construction                                      | Planning   | Construction                 | Planning   |
| TEXAS                                    |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                   |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Bardwell Reservoir                                                                                        | \$6,500,000                                       |            | \$6,500,000                  |            |
| (FC)                                     | Big Fossil Creek                                                                                          | 1,340,000                                         |            | 1,340,000                    |            |
| (R)                                      | Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)                                                                            | 750,000                                           |            | 750,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Buffalo Bayou and tributaries                                                                             | 2,900,000                                         |            | 2,900,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Canyon Reservoir                                                                                          | 614,000                                           |            | 614,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension                                                                 | 200,000                                           |            | 200,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension                                                                  | 600,000                                           |            | 600,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Freeport and vicinity                                                                                     | 300,000                                           |            | 300,000                      |            |
| (R)                                      | Galveston Harbor (jetties)                                                                                | 1,800,000                                         |            | 1,800,000                    |            |
| (N)                                      | Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project                                                             | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria                                           | 2,955,000                                         |            | 2,955,000                    |            |
| (N)                                      | Houston ship channel (40-foot project)                                                                    | 3,200,000                                         |            | 3,200,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Lake Kemp Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                   | \$200,000  |                              | \$200,000  |
| (FC)                                     | Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement                                                      |                                                   | 225,000    |                              | 225,000    |
| (N)                                      | Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels                                                          | 2,477,000                                         |            | 2,477,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Pat Mayse Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                   | 300,000    |                              | 300,000    |
| (N)                                      | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola                           | 2,000,000                                         |            | 2,000,000                    |            |
| (R)                                      | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)                                                            | 800,000                                           |            | 800,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)                                                     |                                                   | 389,000    |                              | 389,000    |
| (N)                                      | Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (MP)                                     | Sabine-Neches waterway (40-foot project)                                                                  | 5,600,000                                         |            | 1,500,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam                                                                              | 1,000,000                                         |            | 5,600,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | San Antonio Channel                                                                                       |                                                   |            | 1,000,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River                                                               |                                                   | 400,000    |                              | 400,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Somerville Reservoir                                                                                      | 5,200,000                                         |            | 5,200,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Stillhouse Hollow Dam                                                                                     | 3,600,000                                         |            | 3,600,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Texas City                                                                                                | 4,300,000                                         |            | 4,300,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Vince and Little Vince Bayous                                                                             |                                                   | 99,000     |                              | 99,000     |
| (FC)                                     | Waco Reservoir                                                                                            | 6,326,000                                         |            | 6,326,000                    |            |
| (N)                                      | Wallisville Reservoir                                                                                     |                                                   | 350,000    |                              | 350,000    |
| VERMONT                                  |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Gaysville Dam (restudy)                                                                                   |                                                   |            |                              | 20,000     |
| VIRGINIA                                 |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (MP)                                     | Gathright Dam                                                                                             |                                                   |            |                              | 150,000    |
| (FC)                                     | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir                                                                       | 5,000,000                                         |            | 5,000,000                    |            |
| (N)                                      | Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay                                                                                   |                                                   |            | 200,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Norfolk                                                                                                   | 1,460,000                                         |            | 1,460,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | North Fork of Pound Reservoir                                                                             | 3,000,000                                         |            | 3,000,000                    |            |
| (BE)                                     | Virginia Beach (reimbursement)                                                                            | 125,000                                           |            | 125,000                      |            |
| WASHINGTON                               |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Colfax                                                                                                    | 1,500,000                                         |            | 1,500,000                    |            |
|                                          | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                         |                                                   |            |                              |            |
|                                          | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2                                         |                                                   |            | 50,000                       |            |
| (R)                                      | Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)                                                             | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                               |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (MP)                                     | Kingston Harbor                                                                                           |                                                   |            | 75,000                       |            |
|                                          | Little Goose lock and dam                                                                                 | 13,000,000                                        |            | 13,000,000                   |            |
| (MP)                                     | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                | 37,500,000                                        |            | 37,500,000                   |            |
| (FC)                                     | Sammamish River                                                                                           | 760,000                                           |            | 760,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Swinomish Slough                                                                                          | 790,000                                           |            | 790,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Tacoma Harbor                                                                                             | 900,000                                           |            | 900,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Washougal area                                                                                            | 700,000                                           |            | 700,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Wynoochee River Reservoir                                                                                 |                                                   | 200,000    |                              | 200,000    |
| WEST VIRGINIA                            |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Beech Fork Reservoir                                                                                      |                                                   | 100,000    |                              | 150,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                             |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Birch Reservoir (deferred)                                                                                |                                                   |            |                              | 50,000     |
| (FC)                                     | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)                                                     |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Buckhannon                                                                                                | 175,000                                           |            | 175,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | East Lynn Reservoir                                                                                       | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                               |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Justice Reservoir                                                                                         |                                                   | 650,000    |                              | 650,000    |
| (N)                                      | Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                             |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (N)                                      | Opekiska lock and dam                                                                                     | 4,800,000                                         |            | 4,800,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                                 |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Summersville Reservoir                                                                                    | 8,244,000                                         |            | 9,000,000                    |            |
|                                          | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| WISCONSIN                                |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)                                                  |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (N)                                      | Eau Claire River, Spring Valley                                                                           | 400,000                                           |            | 400,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)                                                                               |                                                   | 70,000     |                              | 70,000     |
| (N)                                      | Kenosha Harbor                                                                                            | 335,000                                           |            | 335,000                      |            |
| (R)                                      | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)                                                                | 150,000                                           |            | 150,000                      |            |
| (FC)                                     | Kickapoo River                                                                                            |                                                   | 125,000    |                              | 125,000    |
| (N)                                      | Milwaukee Harbor (1935 act)                                                                               | 6,000                                             |            | 6,000                        |            |
| (N)                                      | Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)                                                                               | 400,000                                           |            | 400,000                      |            |
| (R)                                      | Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)                                                                             | 432,000                                           |            | 432,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Saxon Harbor                                                                                              |                                                   |            | 200,000                      |            |
| (R)                                      | Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal                                                                     | 147,000                                           |            | 147,000                      |            |
| MISCELLANEOUS                            |                                                                                                           |                                                   |            |                              |            |
| (FC)                                     | Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation                  | 6,000,000                                         |            | 7,758,000                    |            |
| (FC)                                     | Snagging and clearing                                                                                     | 250,000                                           |            | 250,000                      |            |
| (N)                                      | Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$200,000 (sec. 107)           | 1,500,000                                         |            | 1,949,200                    |            |
| (BE)                                     | Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$400,000           | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
|                                          | Recreation facilities, completed projects                                                                 | 4,000,000                                         |            | 5,000,000                    |            |
|                                          | Small authorized projects                                                                                 | 1,000,000                                         |            | 1,000,000                    |            |
|                                          | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)                                                | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
| (R)                                      | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to \$400,000)                                                   | 500,000                                           |            | 500,000                      |            |
|                                          | Employees compensation                                                                                    | 176,000                                           |            | 176,000                      |            |
|                                          | Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages                                                           | -70,000,000                                       |            | -70,000,000                  |            |
| Grand total, construction, general       |                                                                                                           | 878,439,000<br>(899,108,000)                      | 20,669,000 | 917,782,200<br>(939,943,200) | 22,161,000 |



Within the amount above the House figure for the central and southern Florida project \$300,000 is for the Cutler Drain.

The conferees agree that, if necessary, the Corps of Engineers should use its transfer authority to provide an additional \$500,000

providing full capability of the Corps of \$7.7 million to expedite the construction of the Carlyle Reservoir, Ill.

Amendments No. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Correct a typographical error.

#### Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$77,862,000 instead of \$73,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,920,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

#### Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1965

| Construction, general, State and project        | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |          | Conference allowance |          |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
|                                                 | Construction                                  | Planning | Construction         | Planning |
| 1. General investigations:                      |                                               |          |                      |          |
| (a) Examinations and surveys                    | \$65,000                                      |          | \$125,000            |          |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data          | 85,000                                        |          | 85,000               |          |
| Subtotal, general investigations                | 150,000                                       |          | 210,000              |          |
| 2. Construction and planning:                   |                                               |          |                      |          |
| Mississippi River levees                        | 3,800,000                                     |          | 4,000,000            |          |
| Channel improvement                             | 24,500,000                                    |          | 26,892,000           |          |
| Memphis Harbor                                  | 600,000                                       |          | 600,000              |          |
| Old River control                               | 200,000                                       |          | 200,000              |          |
| St. Francis Basin                               | 3,700,000                                     |          | 3,700,000            |          |
| West Tennessee tributaries                      | 1,400,000                                     |          | 1,400,000            |          |
| Lower Arkansas River                            | 300,000                                       |          | 300,000              |          |
| Tensas Basin:                                   |                                               |          |                      |          |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.                   | 900,000                                       |          | 900,000              |          |
| Red River backwater                             | 200,000                                       |          | 300,000              |          |
| Yazoo Basin:                                    |                                               |          |                      |          |
| Sardis Reservoir                                | 70,000                                        |          | 70,000               |          |
| End Reservoir                                   | 40,000                                        |          | 40,000               |          |
| Arkabutla Reservoir                             | 40,000                                        |          | 40,000               |          |
| Grenada Reservoir                               | 60,000                                        |          | 50,000               |          |
| Greenwood                                       | 700,000                                       |          | 700,000              |          |
| 3. Construction & plan.—Con Yazoo Basin—Con.    |                                               |          |                      |          |
| Upper auxiliary channels                        | \$100,000                                     |          | \$100,000            |          |
| Main stem                                       | 800,000                                       |          | 800,000              |          |
| Tributaries                                     | 1,600,000                                     |          | 1,600,000            |          |
| Big Sunflower River, etc.                       | 650,000                                       |          | 650,000              |          |
| Yazoo backwater                                 | 1,850,000                                     |          | 2,000,000            |          |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries                  | 300,000                                       |          | 300,000              |          |
| Atchafalaya Basin                               | 7,200,000                                     |          | 8,600,000            |          |
| Lake Ponchartrain                               | 210,000                                       |          | 210,000              |          |
| Subtotal, construction and planning             | 49,210,000                                    |          | 53,452,000           |          |
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages | -1,500,000                                    |          | -1,500,000           |          |
| Total, construction and planning                | 47,710,000                                    |          | 51,952,000           |          |
| 3. Maintenance                                  | 24,000,000                                    |          | 25,700,000           |          |
| Grand total                                     | 71,860,000                                    |          | 77,862,000           |          |

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR National Park Service

##### Construction

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$1,800,000 to the National Park Service to extend recreational and utility facilities in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, as proposed by the Senate.

#### Bureau of Reclamation General Investigations

Amendment No. 8: Provides \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House for investigations of projects in Alaska.

Amendments No. 9 and 10: Appropriate \$11,404,000 instead of \$10,354,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,404,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide that \$11,054,000 shall be derived from the Recla-

mation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,054,000 as proposed by the House. The increase above the House figure includes \$50,000 for Alaskan investigations and \$1,000,000 for weather modification research.

##### Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$185,616,500 instead of \$182,433,000 as proposed by the House and \$185,689,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

| Project                                                                                      | Budget estimate | Conference allowance | Project                                             | Budget estimate | Conference allowance |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Delivery of water to Mexico                                                                  |                 | \$2,000,000          | Drainage and minor construction                     | \$1,412,964     | \$1,412,964          |
| Malta, Mont., street improvement                                                             |                 | 26,000               | Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects  | 4,544,251       | 4,144,251            |
| Advance planning                                                                             | \$200,000       | 200,000              | Reclamation office building                         |                 | 2,650,000            |
| Gila project, Arizona                                                                        | 1,190,000       | 1,190,000            | Subtotal                                            | 132,422,015     | 137,682,015          |
| Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California                                    | 4,265,000       | 4,665,000            | Missouri River Basin project:                       |                 |                      |
| Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada                                              | 1,432,000       | 1,482,000            | Ainsworth unit, Nebraska                            | 6,500,000       | 6,500,000            |
| Central Valley project, California                                                           | 55,546,000      | 64,480,000           | Almena unit, Kansas                                 | 1,350,000       | 2,200,000            |
| Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie                                                 | 3,300,000       | 3,300,000            | East Bench unit, Montana                            | 780,000         | 780,000              |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado                                                         | 6,200,000       | 6,200,000            | Farwell unit, Nebraska                              | 2,700,000       | 2,700,000            |
| Mann Creek project, Idaho                                                                    | 725,000         | 725,000              | Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska              | 665,000         | 665,000              |
| Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas                                                     | 1,480,000       | 1,480,000            | Glen Elder unit, Kansas                             | 8,400,000       | 8,400,000            |
| Arbuckle project, Oklahoma                                                                   | 3,500,000       | 3,500,000            | Transmission division                               | 22,175,000      | 21,585,000           |
| Norman project, Oklahoma                                                                     | 3,221,000       | 3,221,000            | Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming                    | 19,950,000      | 19,950,000           |
| Baker project, upper division, Oregon                                                        | 700,000         | 700,000              | Drainage and minor construction                     | 1,915,000       | 1,915,000            |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oregon                  | 400,000         | 400,000              | Investigations                                      | 1,743,000       | 1,893,000            |
| The Dalles project, western division, Oregon                                                 | 2,393,800       | 2,393,800            | Advance planning                                    | 950,000         | 850,000              |
| Canadian River project, Texas                                                                | 22,100,000      | 22,100,000           | Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project              | 67,128,000      | 67,438,000           |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas                            | 783,000         | 783,000              | Other Department of the Interior agencies           | 3,349,000       | 3,371,500            |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas                            | 775,000         | 775,000              | Total, Missouri River Basin project                 | 70,477,000      | 70,809,500           |
| Weber Basin project, Utah                                                                    | 7,786,000       | 7,936,000            | Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation           | 202,899,015     | 208,491,515          |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville, Tonasket unit, Washington | 400,000         | 400,000              | Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays | -17,575,015     | -22,875,015          |
| Columbia Basin project, Washington                                                           | 6,800,000       | 8,300,000            | Total, construction and rehabilitation              | 185,324,000     | 185,616,500          |
| Spokane Valley project, Washington                                                           | 1,918,000       | 1,918,000            |                                                     |                 |                      |
| Riverton project, 3d division, Wyoming                                                       | 1,300,000       | 1,300,000            |                                                     |                 |                      |

Central Valley project, California: Within the funds provided for the Central Valley project \$1,500,000 is to be used to initiate work on the Westlands Water District distribution system. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement on the Senate report statement concerning the deletion of \$2,300,000 for transmission facilities in the San Luis project.

Reclamation office building: The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that this office building is to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation at the site and in conformity with the design already approved by the Bureau.

Missouri River Basin project—Transmission division: The conferees are in agreement that within the amount provided \$100,000 is to be

used to complete studies for a transmission system in the general area between Granite Falls and Jackson, Minn.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and Spencer, Iowa.

Missouri River Basin project—Investigations: The increase over the House figure includes an additional \$75,000 for the Marias-Milk unit, Montana, investigation to determine feasibility of providing irrigation service



to the lower Marias area and an additional \$150,000 for the Nebraska mid-State project. Within available funds \$75,000 shall be used for a feasibility report on the Blue division and \$20,000 for a reconnaissance survey of the Sheep Creek unit.

Other Department of the Interior agencies: The increase above the House figure includes \$22,500 for transfer to the National Park Service for archeological work in the Missouri River Basin.

Amendment No. 12: Provides that \$83,-

030,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House be derived from the reclamation fund.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16: Reported in disagreement.

#### Bonneville Power Administration

##### Construction

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$87,-420,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$41,220,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees on the part of both Houses are in

agreement with the provisions in connection with use of the funds for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie as set out in the Senate report.

#### TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

##### Operating expenses

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,261,-573,000 instead of \$2,261,073,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,268,008,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as follows:

| Program                                          | Budget estimate | Conference allowance | Program                                                   | Budget estimate | Conference allowance |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Raw materials.....                               | \$267,455,000   | \$267,455,000        | Community program.....                                    | \$9,035,000     | \$9,035,000          |
| Special nuclear materials.....                   | 401,500,000     | 398,500,000          | Program direction and administration.....                 | 76,780,000      | 76,000,000           |
| Weapons.....                                     | 771,747,000     | 765,000,000          | Security investigation program.....                       | 7,000,000       | 7,000,000            |
| Reactor development.....                         | 497,900,000     | 494,000,000          | Cost of work for others.....                              | 5,100,000       | 5,100,000            |
| Physical research.....                           | 222,000,000     | 214,000,000          | Change in selected resources.....                         | -13,451,000     | -21,451,000          |
| Biology and medicine.....                        | 80,000,000      | 78,000,000           | Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources..... | -36,066,000     | -47,066,000          |
| Training, education, and information.....        | 17,700,000      | 15,700,000           | Unobligated balance brought forward.....                  |                 | -20,000,000          |
| Isotopes development program.....                | 10,300,000      | 9,300,000            |                                                           |                 |                      |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives..... | 11,000,000      | 11,000,000           | Total.....                                                | 2,323,000,000   | 2,261,573,000        |

The amount provided above the House figure includes \$3,500,000 for the special nuclear materials program; \$4,000,000 for the reactor development program, including \$3,000,000 for the project Pluto; and \$4,000,000 for the physical research program.

#### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

##### Limitation of Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 19: Provides a limitation of \$4,000 instead of \$6,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000 as proposed by the Senate for representation allowances.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN F. JENSEN,  
JOHN R. PILLION,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR USE OF CERTAIN UNIVERSITIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1802)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,  
CECIL R. KING,  
HALE BOGGS,  
JOHN W. BYRNES,  
THOS. B. CURTIS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HARRY F. BYRD,  
RUSSELL B. LONG,  
GEO. A. SMATHERS,  
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
CARL T. CURTIS.

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House would permit duty free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University. The Senate amendment added new provisions to the bill as passed by the House which would permit duty-free entry for the following additional articles:

One rheogoniometer imported for the use of the University of Tennessee.

One rheogoniometer imported for the use of Ohio State University.

One microcalorimeter imported for the use of the University of Colorado.

All stone imported before the enactment of the bill for use in construction of the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery, located at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Under both the bill as passed by the House and under the Senate amendment, if an article was entered before the date of the enactment of the bill the entry shall be liquidated or reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

The House recedes.

The Senate amendment to the title of the bill conformed the title to the amendment made to the text of the bill. The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,  
CECIL R. KING,  
HALE BOGGS,  
JOHN W. BYRNES,  
THOS. B. CURTIS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1803)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,  
CECIL R. KING,  
HALE BOGGS,  
JOHN W. BYRNES,  
THOS. B. CURTIS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HARRY F. BYRD,  
RUSSELL B. LONG,  
GEO. A. SMATHERS,  
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
FRANK CARLSON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Under the bill as passed by the House, the short title for the bill was the "International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963," Senate amendment numbered 1 strikes out "1963" and inserts "1964". The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment adds a new section 4 to the bill providing that whenever the Congress finds, in a concurrent resolution agreed to by the two Houses, that there is an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee in the United States attributable, in whole or in part, to the application or operation of the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, the President shall cause a copy of such concurrent resolution to be transmitted to the International Coffee Council and the Executive Board established under chapter IV of such agreement. The new section 4 would also provide that if, after the expiration of 30 days after the transmittal of such concurrent resolution, the President finds that the Council has failed to make such adjustments of quotas, or to take such







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D. C. 20250

Official business Postage and fees paid  
U. S. Department of Agriculture

Issued Aug. 17, 1964

For actions of Aug. 14 & 15, 1964  
88th-2nd. Nos. 159 & 160

### CONTENTS

|                            |                            |                          |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Accounting.....19          | Food marketing.....1       | Public lands.....26      |
| Adjournment.....11         | Food stamps.....1,37       | Public Law 480.....10    |
| Appalachia.....35          | Foreign aid.....16,29      | Public works.....7       |
| Appropriations.1,7,8,12,13 | Guam.....10                | Records.....39           |
| Audit.....27               | Highways.....4             | Research.....1           |
| Claims.....1,20            | Holiday.....23,28,34       | Roads.....35             |
| Commissions.....1          | Housing.....14             | Selective service.....1  |
| Committees.....3           | Information.....38,39      | Technology.....1         |
| Containers.....21          | Legislative program.....10 | Tobacco.....2            |
| Crop insurance.....10      | Loans.....10               | Vehicles.....24          |
| Economics.....22           | Meat imports.....33        | Vouchers.....19          |
| Education.....5,25         | National parks.....17      | Water resources.....1,38 |
| Electrification.....18     | Pay.....31                 | Watersheds.....9         |
| Expositions.....32         | Pesticides.....1           | Wildlife.....6           |
| Farm labor.....10          | Poverty.....15,36          |                          |
| Fish protein.....30        | Public lands.....1         |                          |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. Senate debated foreign-aid authorization bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on public works appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to establish Public Land Law Review Commission. Senate debated foreign-aid authorization bill.

### HOUSE - Aug. 14

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate (H. Doc. 344) for the Food Stamp Program. The estimate proposes \$15,000,000 by direct appropriation, plus \$45,000,000 by transfer from Sec. 32, for this program; to Appropriations Committee. p. 19105

In addition to the items listed in Digest No. 157, H. Doc. 338 includes the following appropriation estimates: Office of Water Resources Research, Interior Department, \$1,535,000; reviewing the registration of pesticides, Interior Department, \$150,000; National Commission on Food Marketing, \$1,000,000.

Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations to pay claims and judgments rendered against the U. S., as provided by various laws (H. Doc. 339); to Appropriations Committee. p. 19105

Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of \$1 million for the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress (H. Doc. 340); to Appropriations Committee. p. 19105

Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$11,375,000 for the Selective Service System (H. Doc. 343); to the Appropriations Committee. p. 19105

Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations for 1965 in the amount of \$500,000 for the Public Land Law Review Commission (H. Doc. 347); to Appropriations Committee. p. 19105

2. TOBACCO. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. J. Res. 1026, to extend time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 19028-9
3. COMMITTEES. Agreed to H. Res. 820, to provide additional funds for the further expense of studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 38 (for the Agriculture Committee). pp. 19088-9
4. HIGHWAYS. Rep. Fallon inserted the remarks of the President at the signing of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964. p. 19103
5. EDUCATION. Passed with amendments S. 3060, to extend the National Defense Education Act for 3 years and to extend the impacted areas legislation for 2 years. H. R. 11904, a similar bill previously passed, with amendments, was tabled (pp. 19036-75). Rejected an amendment by Rep. O'Hara to extend forgiveness of college loans to teachers teaching overseas in the Peace Corps (pp. 19065-67).
6. WILDLIFE. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on S. 793, to provide a permanent basis for the management of the four wildlife refuges in the Klamath Basin, Calif. and Ore. p. D699
7. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11579, and acted on items in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18968-80, 19029-35
8. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 11134. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 19035
9. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received a letter from the Budget Bureau relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Crooked Lake Bayou, Ark.; Pennahatchee Creek, Ga.; upper Tradewater River, Ky.; Squirrel Creek, Okla.; Willow Swamp, S. C.; and Jewell Brook, Vt.; to H. Agriculture and S. Agriculture and Forestry Committees. pp. 19105, 18902  
Both Houses received a letter from the Budget Bureau relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Home Supply, Colo. Beaverdam Creek, Ga.; South Fork Little River, Ga.; Crabtree Creek, N. C.; Four-Mile Run Creek, Okla.; and Three and Twenty Creek, S. C.; to Public Works Committees. pp. 18903, 19105
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that Mon., Aug. 17, is Consent Calendar day and that the following bills will be brought up under suspension of the rules: S. 277, expansion of Federal crop insurance coverage; H. R. 12298, extension of Public Law 480; H. R. 6242, Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963; and H. R. 7073, to increase Farmers Home Administration loan fund limitation. Consideration on Tues., and the balance of the week will include H. R. 3869, technical agricultural assistance to Guam. pp. 19095-6



convictions come down overwhelmingly on the side of one man, one vote.

I shall discuss a little later the aspect of federalism and its nature, and why it was necessary to compromise, if there was to be a Union at all; and why, in a great national government such as ours, it is desirable to have a Federal system, a degree of sovereignty, and a basis for the delegation of power, because such a system diffuses power and prevents one big Central Government from dominating and prevents the kind of tyranny that can quickly develop, even in a democracy if there is not a Federal system.

But none of that is at stake in providing for equal apportionment in both houses of a State legislature.

As the Twentieth Century Fund stated the point:

The history of democratic institutions points compellingly in the direction of population as the only legitimate basis of representation today.

This is a study that was made by Prof. Gordon E. Baker, of the University of California; Dr. John E. Bebout, of Rutgers University; Prof. Paul T. David, of the University of Virginia; Stanley H. Friedelbaum, associate professor of political science at Rutgers; and Anthony Lewis, who is one of the outstanding correspondents in the Nation, a brilliant reporter for the New York Times. He has covered the Supreme Court for many years.

He understands as well as does any other person in the Nation the judicial aspects and the interrelationship between judicial and legislative government.

This is what this distinguished body found:

The history of democratic institutions points compellingly in the direction of population as the only legitimate basis of representation today. The first parliamentary institutions reflected their feudal origins. Social, economic, and political powers were in the hands of a few families. Communications and transportation were primitive. Government itself had only a marginal effect on most men's lives. In those circumstances it was natural that parliaments should represent not people but great estates, titles, wealth, geographic strongholds. But as feudal concepts of privilege ended and social and economic leveling took place, political responsibility spread also.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who not only is a wonderful Senator, but also is a very colorful and imaginative orator, said earlier that we were protesting baronies. Yesterday, he said we were talking about rotten boroughs. He is right, it is a fact that this area apportionment harks back to a feudal situation.

I read further from the conclusion of the panel:

Under generally accepted democratic theory, that responsibility falls today upon every citizen. At the same time, in an increasingly complex industrialized society, government becomes vastly more important and impinges more heavily on men's lives. It is no longer tolerable for a House of Lords to exercise real legislative power over a people with no voice in it. As transportation and

communications are revolutionized, the logic of separate representation for geographic strongholds disappears. The cry of "one man, one vote" heard today in the emerging new lands of Asia and Africa is no more than a reflection of democratic philosophy learned from the West.

In the year 1962—

The pamphlet was written in 1962—

no basis of representation other than population is defensible if candidly stated and examined for what it is. There is talk, for example, of "area representation." But acres do not vote, nor do trees. When a sparsely settled area is given as many representatives as one much more populous, it simply means that the people in the sparse area have more representation. No matter how stated, it is people who choose the representatives.

The issue here is whether we think some persons should have more influence than others with the State legislatures, whether we believe in "one man-one vote," or do not believe in it.

I continue to read from the 20th Century Fund study:

And so any forthright statement of a non-population theory of representation must rest on one of two propositions: Either there must be an implication that the residents of sparsely populated areas are more virtuous than other Americans and hence deserve more representation in legislatures, or else a contention that they have special needs which can only be met by giving them greater representation than that afforded others.

Belief in rural virtue does exist—

I certainly believe in rural virtue—

but that is not likely to be advanced seriously as a reason for nonpopulation apportionments. Not many legislators would stand up and argue openly that their constituents are so much more honest and intelligent than others that each should have 2 or 3 or 10 votes. In any case, it is impermissible in a mature democracy to start comparing the merits of different population groups for purposes of weighting their votes.

The principal reliance, then, of those who advance something other than population as a basis for representation must be on the argument that certain classes of citizens have special problems that justify giving them more than proportionate power in the legislature. This contention is indeed made in behalf of the rural areas which are now so generally overrepresented in State legislatures; it is often said that the rural population is a minority with special needs that would be neglected in a legislature faithfully representing the State's population as a whole. But surely the problems of cities and suburbs, and their need for government aid, have been as great as those of rural areas in recent decades; yet no one has been heard to argue that city and suburban voters should therefore have been given disproportionate weight in legislatures. As for the argument that rural citizens are a minority needing special protection, would anyone contend that in the States still predominantly rural—North Dakota, for example, or Mississippi—the urban minorities should be given extra legislative seats?

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Not long ago, I received a letter from a constituent in

western Kansas who made what I consider to be a rather valid point on reapportionment. His point was that, on the high plateaus and in the plains, where in some cases there are more cows than people, representation under the "one person, one vote" formula would result in a situation in which any constituent who wished to visit with his representative in the State legislature would have to travel many miles, and a representative who wished to maintain the necessary contacts with his constituents would likewise have to travel very long distances; and he said that the people in such areas are thinking very much about the problems thus involved.

I am sure the same is true in other States—for example, in western Nebraska.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a very legitimate point, and it should be given proper weight. The same problem exists in upper Wisconsin, where there are relatively few people in a large area.

I believe this point was a much stronger one before the advent of the automobile. But today there is no question that even though there are some large districts in Wisconsin and in other States, including Kansas, it is a fact that any representative can, by means of modern transportation, travel from one end of his State district to the other within an hour. Today, with the facilities of modern transportation, it is possible for a representative to cover his district in a relatively short time, and it is likewise possible for a constituent to see his representative without having to take too much time.

If a district is confined to a few blocks in a city, undoubtedly it is easier to do that; but today almost everyone either has an automobile or has access to an automobile; and the improved roads and the faster means of transportation make such communication easily possible, although the problem does exist. Nevertheless, I do not believe it compares in importance with the "one man, one vote" principle, which is basic and vital.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Would the Senator from Wisconsin carry the theory of "one man, one vote" to the U.S. Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed; and later I shall make that point clear, although I shall refer to it briefly now. I would not apply it to the U.S. Senate, because ours is a Federal Union composed of States which have a very definite and clear degree of sovereignty. The 10th amendment reserves to the States all the powers not expressly conferred by the Constitution upon the Federal Government. That was made clear in the Constitution. Before the adoption of the Constitution the individual States raised their own taxes and maintained their own armies. So the Union was created only by means of a compromise, which brought about the creation of a powerful central government which can wage war and can im-



pose taxes throughout the Nation; yet each State is to have as much sovereignty as possible. That is possible in important part, I believe, by having two Senators for each State. That arrangement is most wholesome, and I favor it.

Mr. CURTIS. Would not the Senator from Wisconsin agree that when the Federal Government was formed, the States delegated certain powers to it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. In short, the Federal Government is one of delegated powers. The States never delegated to the Federal Government any power over the State constitutions—in this case, in regard to the establishment of their own legislatures—did they?

Mr. PROXMIRE. When the Constitution was written, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows, there were no constitutional amendments. The Constitution as initially created is not the same as the one we have today. As the Senator from Nebraska well knows, the original Constitution was amended, not only by the Bill of Rights—which many of us feel are among the most important provisions of the Constitution—but also by the 14th amendment, which I believe has correctly been construed by the Supreme Court of the United States as meaning that the States delegated to the Federal Government the responsibility to prohibit individual States from abridging the privileges of citizens of the United States. Certainly one such privilege is an equal vote. It is in my book just as important as the right of freedom of speech or the right of freedom of assembly or the right of freedom of the press.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Wisconsin has a right to his views; but I point out that the States never provided the Federal Government with the right to provide for the State legislatures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that was done by means of the 14th amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, no. The phrase "one person, one vote" is a catch phrase, but it does not have nearly the validity that is applied, for example, in a court of law, to the parties to a suit. Each party may be well represented by an attorney. The adversary party is just one person, and has perhaps one attorney; but that does not mean that the parties are denied equal rights, or that one of them has a 50-percent handicap.

The doctrine of the recent Supreme Court decision was just picked out of thin air. I do not believe there is any justification in the Constitution for the Federal Government to assert authority as to how the States shall make up their legislatures.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My answer is that I believe the 14th amendment does provide that. Some people would dispute that the 14th amendment was properly ratified; I understand that was disputed yesterday by a very distinguished Member of the other body.

I shall read the part of the amendment which I believe provides this protection:

#### ARTICLE XIV

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall an State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

I suppose one can construe that in various ways. But it seems to me that a proper construction—and I believe a highly desirable, perfectly proper, logical construction—is that privileges of American citizen—not to be abridged by the States—include the right to an equal vote for the State legislature, if privileges or citizenship mean anything.

Mr. CURTIS. No. Equal representation does not mean that. It means that the whole body of laws will give the same protection to one citizen that it gives to another. We cannot follow the argument that the Senator is advancing without coming to the conclusion that the Senate should no longer be constituted as it is, but that it should be on a population basis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, no indeed.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the 14th amendment not binding on the Federal Government?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There may be a contradiction, as there are in many of our documents. But I believe it is very clear that there are many reasons that the Senate of the United States is an eternal institution. As long as the Republic lasts, there will be a Senate of the United States. Because, of course, we cannot deprive a State of their two Senators, even by an amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. How do we know? The Supreme Court with one decision nullified many of the State constitutions. I contend that they had no authority to do it whatever. The States have never delegated authority to the Central Government to override State constitutions with regard to how the States set up their legislative bodies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is making two arguments. One argument is that the States have never delegated the authority over a citizen's right to vote. I say that that authority was delegated in the 14th amendment. The other argument the Senator is making is that there is no real difference between the State right to have one body not based on population and the Federal right to have a Senate not based on population. I believe we all recognize that the Senate was established in the Constitution with great wisdom. I believe no one can deny that there is clear and proper element of sovereignty in the States. This is because the sovereign States surrendered part, but only part, of their sovereignty when they became States. Without this retention of sovereignty by individual States, there would have been no United States.

But where is the sovereignty of the

counties, or towns, or rural areas? Where? There is not any. No county has ever created a State. States create, abolish, extend, modify counties at will. To treat them as "little States" is ridiculous.

It is true the Federal Government may delegate some of its power to the States.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no delegation to the States. The States have the power of delegating to the Federal Government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that the Senator is making a legal argument. I am making a practical political argument. The Federal Government may under some circumstances delegate part of its taxing authority, if it may wish to do so, under some certain circumstances, and delegate other power at times.

Mr. CURTIS. That is exercising power that the States have specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. From the very beginning it was given the power to tax. By amending the Constitution, it was given the power to tax income. But they have never given them power to set up the State legislature.

I believe it is time for the whole country to serve notice on the Supreme Court that it is not a legislative body, that it is not omnipotent. States do have sovereignty. The real sovereignty rests in people. The same people that brought forth the Constitution of the United States brought forth the State constitutions. The State constitutions existed before the Federal constitution. Every new State that comes into the Union has all of the powers that each of the original 13 States had.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, it seems to me it is just fundamental that we should recognize that the Supreme Court of the United States has a duty to provide a protection for individual citizens, of their fundamental right—the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] calls it an inalienable right. Thomas Jefferson said that the principle is as clear as it can be that there is a right of equal representation in the State legislatures.

The Senator from Nebraska may feel that that is legislation by the Supreme Court. I feel that it is an action in complete compliance with their duty and obligation under the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission,



the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 13, 1965, p. 18762, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all of the Senate conferees, although the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] signed except for amendment No. 2, construction, general, of the Corps of Engineers.

The reason for that was that a project added by the Senate in the State of Washington was not agreed to by the conferees. It was left out. For that reason, I presume the Senator took exception to the conference agreement on amendment No. 2.

Mr. President, the printed conference report indicates opposite the name of Senator LISTER HILL, the words, "except for amendment No. 2." That language, "except for amendment No. 2," should appear opposite the name of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. There was an

error in the printed copy of the conference report. However, it was correct as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

All legislation is the result of compromise. I believe that the Senate conferees did unusually well in upholding the position of the Senate. The conference report provides \$4,430,794,700, which is \$12,488,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$104,825,500 above the House; \$9,954,300 below the budget; and \$23,554,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1964.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary table explaining the action of the conferees on the various items in the bill.

There being no objection, the summary table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary table

| Item                                                                     | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance | Item                                                        | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| <b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL</b>                               |                 |                  |                      | <b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>        |                 |                  |                      |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>                                            |                 |                  |                      | <b>SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION</b>                    |                 |                  |                      |
| <b>CEMETERIAL EXPENSES</b>                                               |                 |                  |                      | Operation and maintenance.....                              | \$1,000,000     | \$1,000,000      | \$1,000,000          |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                               | \$13,295,000    | \$13,295,000     | \$13,295,000         | <b>SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION</b>                    |                 |                  |                      |
| <b>CORPS OF ENGINEERS — CIVIL</b>                                        |                 |                  |                      | Construction.....                                           | 2,610,000       | 2,610,000        | 2,610,000            |
| General investigations.....                                              | 20,590,000      | 22,269,000       | 22,194,000           | Operation and maintenance.....                              | 1,680,000       | 1,680,000        | 1,680,000            |
| Construction, general.....                                               | 905,767,200     | 942,791,200      | 939,943,200          | Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)..... | (4,500,000)     | (4,500,000)      | (4,500,000)          |
| Operation and maintenance, general.....                                  | 158,676,000     | 158,676,000      | 158,676,000          | Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....               | 4,290,000       | 4,290,000        | 4,290,000            |
| Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies.....          | 4,150,000       | 4,150,000        | 4,150,000            | Total, definite appropriations.....                         | 379,503,000     | 433,809,000      | 432,736,500          |
| General expenses.....                                                    | 15,575,000      | 15,575,000       | 15,575,000           | Total, indefinite appropriations.....                       | 8,769,000       | 8,769,000        | 8,769,000            |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....                    | 73,550,000      | 79,920,000       | 77,862,000           | Total, title II.....                                        | 388,272,000     | 442,578,000      | 441,505,500          |
| U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.....           |                 |                  |                      | <b>TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION</b>                   |                 |                  |                      |
| Total, rivers and harbours and flood control.....                        | 1,178,308,200   | 1,223,381,200    | 1,218,400,200        | Operating expenses.....                                     | 2,261,073,000   | 2,268,008,000    | 2,261,573,000        |
| <b>THE PANAMA CANAL</b>                                                  |                 |                  |                      | Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                   | (36,066,000)    | (47,066,000)     | (47,066,000)         |
| Canal Zone Government:                                                   |                 |                  |                      | Plant and capital equipment.....                            | 363,000,000     | 363,000,000      | 363,000,000          |
| Operating expenses.....                                                  | 29,088,000      | 29,088,000       | 29,088,000           | Total, Atomic Energy Commission.....                        | 2,624,073,000   | 2,631,008,000    | 2,624,573,000        |
| Capital outlay.....                                                      | 4,821,000       | 4,821,000        | 4,821,000            | Total, definite appropriation.....                          | 2,624,073,000   | 2,631,008,000    | 2,624,573,000        |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses..... | (10,639,000)    | (10,639,000)     | (10,639,000)         | Total, indefinite appropriation.....                        | 36,066,000      | 47,066,000       | 47,066,000           |
| Total, the Panama Canal.....                                             | 33,909,000      | 33,909,000       | 33,909,000           | Total, title III.....                                       | 2,660,139,000   | 2,678,074,000    | 2,671,639,000        |
| Total, title I.....                                                      | 1,225,512,200   | 1,270,585,200    | 1,265,604,200        | <b>TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES</b>                         |                 |                  |                      |
| <b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>                               |                 |                  |                      | St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:                |                 |                  |                      |
| <b>NATIONAL PARK SERVICE</b>                                             |                 |                  |                      | Limitation on administrative expenses.....                  | (450,000)       | (450,000)        | (450,000)            |
| Construction (supplemental, 1965).....                                   |                 | 1,800,000        | 1,800,000            | Tennessee Valley Authority.....                             | 47,915,000      | 47,915,000       | 47,915,000           |
| <b>BUREAU OF RECLAMATION</b>                                             |                 |                  |                      | Delaware River Basin Commission:                            |                 |                  |                      |
| General investigations.....                                              | 10,354,000      | 12,404,000       | 11,404,000           | Salaries and expenses.....                                  | 39,000          | 39,000           | 39,000               |
| Construction and rehabilitation.....                                     | 182,433,000     | 185,689,000      | 185,616,500          | Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission.....    | 92,000          | 92,000           | 92,000               |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                           | 40,219,000      | 40,219,000       | 40,219,000           | Total, Delaware River Basin Commission.....                 | 131,000         | 131,000          | 131,000              |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                                | (4,269,000)     | (4,269,000)      | (4,269,000)          | <b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>                  |                 |                  |                      |
| Loan program.....                                                        | 12,307,000      | 12,307,000       | 12,307,000           | Public works acceleration.....                              | 4,000,000       | 4,000,000        | 4,000,000            |
| Emergency fund.....                                                      |                 | 1,000,000        | 1,000,000            | Total, title IV.....                                        | 52,046,000      | 52,046,000       | 52,046,000           |
| Upper Colorado River Basin fund.....                                     | 62,300,000      | 62,300,000       | 62,300,000           | <b>Grand totals:</b>                                        |                 |                  |                      |
| General administrative expenses.....                                     | 10,400,000      | 10,400,000       | 10,400,000           | Total, definite appropriations.....                         | 4,281,134,200   | 4,387,448,200    | 4,374,959,700        |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....                                        | 318,013,000     | 324,319,000      | 323,246,500          | Total, indefinite appropriations.....                       | 44,835,000      | 55,835,000       | 55,835,000           |
| <b>BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION</b>                                   |                 |                  |                      | Grand total, all titles.....                                | 4,325,969,200   | 4,443,283,200    | 4,430,794,700        |
| Construction.....                                                        | 41,220,000      | 87,420,000       | 87,420,000           |                                                             |                 |                  |                      |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                           | 14,980,000      | 14,980,000       | 14,980,000           |                                                             |                 |                  |                      |
| Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....                              | 56,200,000      | 102,400,000      | 102,400,000          |                                                             |                 |                  |                      |



## TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for general investigations of the Corps of Engineers the bill provides \$22,194,000 which is \$75,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$1,604,000 above the amount allowed by the House; \$2,-

399,000 above the budget; and \$3,079,000 above the appropriation for 1964.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## General investigations, fiscal year 1965

| Item                                                                                      | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| (1)                                                                                       | (2)                                           | (3)             | (4)              | (5)                  |
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS                                                                    |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| 1. Surveys:                                                                               |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| (a) Navigation studies.....                                                               | \$2,257,000                                   | \$2,618,000     | \$3,135,000      | \$3,135,000          |
| (b) Flood control studies.....                                                            | 5,835,000                                     | 6,576,000       | 7,166,000        | 7,091,000            |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperative studies.....                                                | 458,000                                       | 523,000         | 523,000          | 523,000              |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies:                                                          |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| Big Black River, Miss.....                                                                | 65,000                                        | 65,000          | 65,000           | 65,000               |
| Big Muddy River, Ill.....                                                                 | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000          | 125,000              |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H.....                                  | 275,000                                       | 275,000         | 275,000          | 275,000              |
| Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.....                                                    | 130,000                                       | 130,000         | 130,000          | 130,000              |
| Grand River Basin, Mich.....                                                              | 175,000                                       | 175,000         | 175,000          | 175,000              |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C.....                                                  | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000          | 250,000              |
| Missouri River Basin.....                                                                 | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000          | 250,000              |
| Ohio River Basin review.....                                                              | 375,000                                       | 375,000         | 357,000          | 375,000              |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.....                                                         | 125,000                                       | 200,000         | 125,000          | 200,000              |
| Pearl River Basin, Miss.....                                                              | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000          | 125,000              |
| Puget Sound area, Washington.....                                                         | 275,000                                       | 275,000         | 275,000          | 275,000              |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.....                               | 300,000                                       | 300,000         | 300,000          | 300,000              |
| Sahine River, Tex.....                                                                    | 130,000                                       | 130,000         | 130,000          | 130,000              |
| St. John River Basin, Maine.....                                                          | 75,000                                        | 75,000          | 75,000           | 75,000               |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md.....                                           | 400,000                                       | 400,000         | 400,000          | 400,000              |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin.....                                                        | 350,000                                       | 350,000         | 350,000          | 350,000              |
| Wabash River, Ind., and Ill.....                                                          | 425,000                                       | 778,000         | 425,000          | 550,000              |
| White River Basin, Ark., and Mo.....                                                      | 300,000                                       | 300,000         | 300,000          | 300,000              |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg.....                                                         | 350,000                                       | 350,000         | 350,000          | 350,000              |
| (e) Special studies:                                                                      |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana..... | 125,000                                       | 125,000         | 125,000          | 125,000              |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.).....      | 260,000                                       | 260,000         | 260,000          | 260,000              |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.....                                               | 200,000                                       | 200,000         | 200,000          | 200,000              |
| Jersey Meadows, N.Y., and N.J.....                                                        | 150,000                                       | 150,000         | 150,000          | 150,000              |
| Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.....                                                      | 200,000                                       | 200,000         | 200,000          | 200,000              |
| Texas coast.....                                                                          | 250,000                                       | 250,000         | 250,000          | 250,000              |
| Subtotal, surveys.....                                                                    | 14,035,000                                    | 15,830,000      | 16,509,000       | 16,634,000           |
| 2. Collection and study of basic data:                                                    |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| (a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....                                           | 280,000                                       | 280,000         | 280,000          | 280,000              |
| (b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....                                      | 480,000                                       | 480,000         | 480,000          | 480,000              |
| (c) Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....      | 210,000                                       | 210,000         | 210,000          | 210,000              |
| (d) International water studies.....                                                      | 85,000                                        | 85,000          | 85,000           | 85,000               |
| (e) Flood plain studies.....                                                              | 725,000                                       | 725,000         | 725,000          | 725,000              |
| Subtotal, collection and study of basic.....                                              | 1,780,000                                     | 1,780,000       | 1,780,000        | 1,780,000            |
| 3. Research and development:                                                              |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| (a) Coastal engineering research and development.....                                     | 850,000                                       | 850,000         | 850,000          | 850,000              |
| (b) Hydrologic studies.....                                                               | 190,000                                       | 190,000         | 190,000          | 190,000              |
| (c) Civil works investigations.....                                                       | 1,500,000                                     | 1,500,000       | 1,500,000        | 1,500,000            |
| (d) Mississippi Basin model:                                                              |                                               |                 |                  |                      |
| (1) Mississippi River comprehensive study.....                                            | 210,000                                       | 210,000         | 210,000          | 210,000              |
| (2) Maintenance.....                                                                      | 150,000                                       | 150,000         | 150,000          | 150,000              |
| (e) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.....                                | 1,080,000                                     | 1,080,000       | 1,080,000        | 1,080,000            |
| Subtotal, research and development.....                                                   | 3,980,000                                     | 3,980,000       | 3,980,000        | 3,980,000            |
| General reduction due to slippage.....                                                    |                                               | -1,000,000      |                  | -200,000             |
| Total, general investigations.....                                                        | 19,795,000                                    | 20,590,000      | 22,269,000       | 22,194,000           |

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am especially happy that the distinguished chairman held out for this item. This is the item that looks ahead. It looks forward to programs in the future, and discards suggested programs for the future if they are not sound. I was particularly interested in this program for that reason.

I compliment the distinguished Senator on having come through conference with practically all of the amount placed in the item by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to say that I believe this is the first time that the House accepted the figures almost in toto that we submitted. The reduction in this item was only \$75,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

## CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Mr. ELLENDER. For construction, general, the conference bill provides \$939,943,200, which is \$2,848,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$34,176,000 above the House; and \$112,796,700 above the 1964 appropriation.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As I stated earlier when the bill was before the Senate, the House added some new unbudgeted items, which upon review by the Senate committee proved to be desirable projects, and the committee recommended approval of their inclusion in the bill. The Senate concurred in that recommendation.

The House added 15 new planning starts, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The Senate added eight new planning starts, and the House approved seven of these additional planning items approved by the Senate.

The House added 17 new construction starts involving a future commitment of \$199,609,000. These projects were accepted by the Senate. The Senate added 15 additional construction starts. The House accepted 11 of the new starts added by the Senate having a future commitment of \$126,149,000. The budget provided for 35 new starts having a future commitment of \$511,267,000. Thus, the conference bill provides for 63 new construction starts involving a future commitment of \$837,025,000, or less than 1 year's work at the current rate of appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                 | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |           | House allowance |           | Senate allowance |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| (1)                                      |                                                                                                                 | Construction                                  | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  | Construction     | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| (1)                                      |                                                                                                                 | (2)                                           | (3)       | (4)             | (5)       | (6)              | (7)       | (8)                  | (9)       |
| ALABAMA                                  |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Claiborne lock and dam                                                                                          | \$1,000,000                                   |           | \$1,000,000     |           | \$1,000,000      |           | \$1,000,000          |           |
| (N)                                      | Holt lock and dam                                                                                               | 8,000,000                                     |           | 8,000,000       |           | 8,000,000        |           | 8,000,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Jones Bluff lock and dam                                                                                        |                                               | \$134,000 |                 | \$134,000 |                  | \$134,000 |                      | \$134,000 |
| (MP)                                     | Millers Ferry lock and dam                                                                                      | 6,000,000                                     |           | 6,000,000       |           | 6,000,000        |           | 6,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel                                                                                   | 1,500,000                                     |           | 1,500,000       |           | 2,476,000        |           | 2,476,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. Tombigbee River and Tributaries, Ala. and Miss. (See Mississippi.) |                                               | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 225,000   |                      | 100,000   |
|                                          | West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)                                                                     |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| ALASKA                                   |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Repairs on other navigation projects in Alaska                                                                  |                                               |           |                 |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (MP)                                     | Snettisham power project                                                                                        |                                               | 750,000   |                 | 750,000   |                  | 750,000   |                      | 750,000   |
| ARIZONA                                  |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Alamo Reservoir                                                                                                 | 2,500,000                                     |           | 2,500,000       |           | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir                                                               |                                               | 251,000   |                 | 251,000   |                  | 251,000   |                      | 251,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Pinal Creek                                                                                                     |                                               | 55,000    |                 | 55,000    |                  | 55,000    |                      | 55,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Tucson diversion channel                                                                                        | 2,400,000                                     |           | 2,400,000       |           | 2,400,000        |           | 2,400,000            |           |
| ARKANSAS                                 |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:                                                          |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
|                                          | (a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification                                                                | 15,000,000                                    |           | 15,000,000      |           | 15,000,000       |           | 15,000,000           |           |
|                                          | (b) Navigation locks and dams                                                                                   | 51,500,000                                    |           | 47,000,000      |           | 51,500,000       |           | 51,500,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Beaver Reservoir                                                                                                | 4,500,000                                     |           | 4,500,000       |           | 4,500,000        |           | 4,500,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Dardanelle lock and dam                                                                                         | 10,000,000                                    |           | 10,000,000      |           | 10,000,000       |           | 10,000,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Degray Reservoir                                                                                                | 7,100,000                                     |           | 7,100,000       |           | 7,100,000        |           | 7,100,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | De Queen Reservoir                                                                                              |                                               | 245,000   |                 | 245,000   |                  | 245,000   |                      | 245,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Dierks Reservoir                                                                                                |                                               | 150,000   |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Garland City                                                                                                    | 250,000                                       |           | 250,000         |           | 250,000          |           | 250,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Gilliam Reservoir                                                                                               | 2,500,000                                     |           | 2,500,000       |           | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Maniee Bayou, upstream extension                                                                                | 100,000                                       |           | 100,000         |           | 100,000          |           | 100,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Millwood Reservoir                                                                                              | 17,697,000                                    |           | 17,697,000      |           | 17,697,000       |           | 17,697,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit                                                                          | 350,000                                       |           | 350,000         |           | 350,000          |           | 350,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.                                                                         | 3,000,000                                     |           | 3,000,000       |           | 3,000,000        |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Ozark lock and dam                                                                                              | 1,000,000                                     |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.                                  | 300,000                                       |           | 300,000         |           | 300,000          |           | 300,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts                                                        |                                               | 87,000    |                 | 87,000    |                  | 87,000    |                      | 87,000    |
| CALIFORNIA                               |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam                                                                                    | 750,000                                       |           | 750,000         |           | 750,000          |           | 750,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Bear Creek                                                                                                      | 900,000                                       |           | 900,000         |           | 900,000          |           | 900,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Buchanan Reservoir                                                                                              |                                               | 200,000   |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Camanche Reservoir                                                                                              | 3,350,000                                     |           | 3,350,000       |           | 3,350,000        |           | 3,350,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Corte Madera Creek                                                                                              |                                               | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (N)                                      | Dana Point Harbor                                                                                               |                                               | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement                                                      |                                               | 450,000   |                 | 450,000   |                  | 450,000   |                      | 450,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Hidden Reservoir                                                                                                |                                               | 250,000   |                 | 250,000   |                  | 250,000   |                      | 250,000   |
| (BE)                                     | Imperial Beach (reimbursement)                                                                                  | 26,000                                        |           | 26,000          |           | 26,000           |           | 26,000               |           |
| (FC)                                     | Los Angeles County drainage area                                                                                | 15,000,000                                    |           | 15,000,000      |           | 15,000,000       |           | 15,000,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries                                                                         | 1,000,000                                     |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor                                                                                   | 600,000                                       |           | 600,000         |           | 600,000          |           | 600,000              |           |
|                                          | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)                                                           |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Merced River Reservoirs (New Erchequer Dam)                                                                     |                                               | 50,000    |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |
| (N)                                      | Monterey Harbor                                                                                                 |                                               | 90,000    |                 | 90,000    |                  | 150,000   |                      | 90,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Mormon Slough                                                                                                   |                                               | 75,000    |                 | 75,000    |                  | 75,000    |                      | 75,000    |
| (FC)                                     | New Don Pedro Reservoir                                                                                         |                                               |           |                 |           | 150,000          |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                     | New Melones Reservoir                                                                                           |                                               | 450,000   |                 | 700,000   |                  | 700,000   |                      | 700,000   |
| (N)                                      | Oakland Harbor                                                                                                  |                                               |           |                 | 110,000   |                  | 110,000   |                      | 110,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Oroville Reservoir                                                                                              | 9,000,000                                     |           | 8,390,000       |           | 8,390,000        |           | 8,390,000            |           |
| (BE)                                     | Point Mugu to San Pedro (reimbursement)                                                                         | 196,000                                       |           | 196,000         |           | 196,000          |           | 196,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Redwood Creek                                                                                                   |                                               | 125,000   |                 | 125,000   |                  | 125,000   |                      | 125,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Sacramento River bank protection                                                                                | 1,150,000                                     |           | 1,150,000       |           | 1,250,000        |           | 1,250,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Sacramento River deep water ship channel                                                                        | 350,000                                       |           | 350,000         |           | 350,000          |           | 350,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries                                                                | 1,530,000                                     |           | 1,530,000       |           | 1,530,000        |           | 1,530,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Santa Barbara Harbor                                                                                            |                                               |           |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (N)                                      | (Santa Cruz Harbor)                                                                                             |                                               |           |                 |           | 105,000          |           | 105,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | (Tahchevah Creek)                                                                                               | 830,000                                       |           | 830,000         |           | 1,160,000        |           | 1,160,000            |           |
| (BE)                                     | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)                                                                           | 224,000                                       |           | 224,000         |           | 224,000          |           | 224,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Walnut Creek                                                                                                    | 1,810,000                                     |           | 1,810,000       |           | 1,810,000        |           | 1,810,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | West Fork Reservoir                                                                                             |                                               | 207,000   |                 | 207,000   |                  | 207,000   |                      | 207,000   |
| COLORADO                                 |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Trinidad Reservoir                                                                                              |                                               |           | 750,000         |           | 750,000          |           | 750,000              |           |
| CONNECTICUT                              |                                                                                                                 |                                               |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Ansonia-Derby                                                                                                   |                                               | 175,000   |                 | 175,000   |                  | 175,000   |                      | 175,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Black Rock Reservoir                                                                                            |                                               | 50,000    |                 | 50,000    |                  | 50,000    |                      | 50,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Colebrook River Reservoir                                                                                       | 500,000                                       |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Connecticut River below Hartford, North Cove at Old Saybrook                                                    |                                               |           | 578,000         |           | 578,000          |           | 578,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | (Hancock Brook Reservoir)                                                                                       | 1,279,000                                     |           | 1,279,000       |           | 1,279,000        |           | 1,279,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Hop Brook Reservoir                                                                                             | 400,000                                       |           | 400,000         |           | 400,000          |           | 400,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | New London Barrier                                                                                              |                                               | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | (Northfield Brook Reservoir)                                                                                    | 1,346,000                                     |           | 1,346,000       |           | 1,346,000        |           | 1,346,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Stamford                                                                                                        | 1,700,000                                     |           | 1,700,000       |           | 1,700,000        |           | 1,700,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | West Thompson Reservoir                                                                                         | 2,300,000                                     |           | 2,300,000       |           | 2,300,000        |           | 2,300,000            |           |

Footnotes at end of table.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                                 | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |                     | House allowance  |           | Senate allowance       |           | Conference allowance   |           |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|
| (1)                                      |                                                                                                                 | Construction                                  | Planning            | Construction     | Planning  | Construction           | Planning  | Construction           | Planning  |
| (1)                                      |                                                                                                                 | (2)                                           | (3)                 | (4)              | (5)       | (6)                    | (7)       | (8)                    | (9)       |
| <b>DELAWARE</b>                          |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
|                                          | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)      |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (N)                                      | Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | \$11,500,000                                  |                     | \$11,500,000     |           | \$11,500,000           |           | \$11,500,000           |           |
| (BE)                                     | Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)                                                            | 110,000                                       |                     | 110,000          |           | 110,000                |           | 110,000                |           |
| <b>FLORIDA</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (N)                                      | Apalachicola River channel improvement                                                                          | 100,000                                       |                     | 100,000          |           | 100,000                |           | 100,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | Canaveral Harbor                                                                                                | 3,900,000                                     |                     | 3,900,000        |           | 3,900,000              |           | 3,900,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Central and southern Florida                                                                                    | <sup>2</sup> 13,800,000                       |                     | 13,500,000       |           | 14,500,000             |           | 14,150,000             |           |
| (N)                                      | Cross-Florida Barge Canal                                                                                       | 4,000,000                                     |                     | 4,000,000        |           | 4,000,000              |           | 4,000,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Four River Basins                                                                                               |                                               | \$200,000           |                  | \$200,000 |                        | \$200,000 |                        | \$200,000 |
| (N)                                      | Intracoastal Waterway: Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River                                                    | 700,000                                       |                     | 700,000          |           | 850,000                |           | 850,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | (Miami Harbor)                                                                                                  | 1,076,000                                     |                     | 1,076,000        |           | 1,076,000              |           | 1,076,000              |           |
| (BE)                                     | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)                                   | 10,000                                        |                     | 10,000           |           | 10,000                 |           | 10,000                 |           |
| (N)                                      | Palm Beach Harbor                                                                                               | 1,300,000                                     |                     | 1,300,000        |           | 1,300,000              |           | 1,300,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Pensacola Harbor                                                                                                | 300,000                                       |                     | 300,000          |           | 550,000                |           | 550,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | (Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act))                                                                             | <sup>1</sup> 1,254,000                        |                     | 1,254,000        |           | 1,254,000              |           | 1,254,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channel                                                                      | 150,000                                       |                     | 150,000          |           | 150,000                |           | 150,000                |           |
| <b>GEORGIA</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
|                                          | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                         |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (MP)                                     | Carters Dam                                                                                                     | 6,000,000                                     |                     | 6,000,000        |           | 6,000,000              |           | 6,000,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | (Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin)                                                                   | 340,000                                       |                     | 340,000          |           | 340,000                |           | 340,000                |           |
| (NP)                                     | West Point Reservoir: Ato, and Go                                                                               |                                               | 500,000             |                  | 500,000   |                        | 500,000   |                        | 500,000   |
| <b>HAWAII</b>                            |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (N)                                      | Haleiwa small boat harbor (sec. 107)                                                                            | ( <sup>3</sup> )                              |                     | ( <sup>3</sup> ) |           | ( <sup>3</sup> )       |           | ( <sup>3</sup> )       |           |
| (N)                                      | Hilo Harbor                                                                                                     |                                               | 550,000             |                  | 550,000   |                        | 550,000   |                        | 550,000   |
| (R)                                      | Kahului Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                     | 1,000,000                                     |                     | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000              |           | 1,000,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Kawainui Swamp                                                                                                  | 700,000                                       |                     | 700,000          |           | 700,000                |           | 700,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | Naviliwili Harbor (sec. 107)                                                                                    |                                               |                     |                  |           | <sup>3</sup> (144,000) |           | <sup>3</sup> (144,000) |           |
| <b>IDAHO</b>                             |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (FC)                                     | Blockfoot Reservoir                                                                                             |                                               | 46,000              |                  | 46,000    |                        | 46,000    |                        | 46,000    |
| (MP)                                     | Dworshak (Bruce Eddy) Reservoir                                                                                 | 8,500,000                                     |                     | 8,500,000        |           | 8,500,000              |           | 8,500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Heise-Roberts extension                                                                                         |                                               | 70,000              |                  | 70,000    |                        | 70,000    |                        | 70,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Ririe Reservoir                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  | 400,000   |                        | 400,000   |                        | 400,000   |
| <b>ILLINOIS</b>                          |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (BA)                                     | Calumet River, bridges                                                                                          | <sup>1</sup> 1,300,000                        |                     | 1,300,000        |           | 1,300,000              |           | 1,300,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.: (a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)         | 1,500,000                                     |                     | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000              |           | 2,500,000              |           |
|                                          | (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor (1960 act)                                                   | 2,500,000                                     |                     | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000              |           | 2,500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Carlyle Reservoir                                                                                               | 7,200,000                                     |                     | 7,200,000        |           | 7,200,000              |           | 7,200,000              |           |
| (R)                                      | Chicago Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                     | 700,000                                       |                     | 700,000          |           | 700,000                |           | 700,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | East St. Louis and vicinity                                                                                     | 400,000                                       |                     | 400,000          |           | 400,000                |           | 400,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | England Pond Levee                                                                                              |                                               |                     |                  | 30,000    |                        |           |                        | 30,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Freepport                                                                                                       |                                               | 125,000             |                  | 125,000   |                        | 125,000   |                        | 125,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 1                                                                        |                                               |                     |                  |           | 100,000                |           | 100,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | Henderson County Drainage District No. 2                                                                        |                                               |                     |                  |           | 100,000                |           | 100,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana                                         | 5,000,000                                     |                     | 5,000,000        |           | 5,000,000              |           | 5,000,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Indian Grave Drainage District                                                                                  |                                               | 96,000              |                  | 96,000    |                        | 96,000    |                        | 96,000    |
|                                          | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)                                                              |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (N)                                      | Kaskaskia River                                                                                                 |                                               | 400,000             |                  | 400,000   |                        | 60,000    | 400,000                | 400,000   |
| (FC)                                     | McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District                                                                         |                                               | 140,000             |                  | 140,000   |                        | 140,000   |                        | 140,000   |
| (N)                                      | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (a) Regulating works                           | 2,000,000                                     |                     | 2,000,000        |           | 2,000,000              |           | 2,000,000              |           |
|                                          | (b) Chain of Rocks                                                                                              | 1,300,000                                     |                     | 1,300,000        |           | 1,300,000              |           | 1,300,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Mount Carmel                                                                                                    | 700,000                                       |                     | 700,000          |           | 700,000                |           | 700,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | New Athens                                                                                                      | 120,000                                       |                     | 120,000          |           | 120,000                |           | 120,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | Oakley Reservoir                                                                                                |                                               | 275,000             |                  | 275,000   |                        | 275,000   |                        | 275,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Proirie Du Pont Levee and Sanitary District                                                                     |                                               |                     |                  | 47,000    |                        | 47,000    |                        | 47,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Rend Lake Reservoir                                                                                             | 1,000,000                                     |                     | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000              |           | 1,000,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Richland Creek                                                                                                  |                                               | 200,000             |                  | 200,000   |                        | 200,000   |                        | 200,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee                                                                             | 750,000                                       |                     | 750,000          |           | 750,000                |           | 750,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | Saline River and tributaries                                                                                    |                                               | <sup>1</sup> 75,000 |                  | 75,000    |                        | 75,000    |                        | 75,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Shelbyville Reservoir                                                                                           | 2,800,000                                     |                     | 2,800,000        |           | 2,800,000              |           | 2,800,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Sny Island Levee and Drainage District                                                                          |                                               | 400,000             |                  | 400,000   |                        |           | 400,000                |           |
| (FC)                                     | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District                            | 1,000,000                                     |                     | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000              |           | 1,000,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | The Sny Basin                                                                                                   | 1,700,000                                     |                     | 1,700,000        |           | 1,700,000              |           | 1,700,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Tri-Pond levee                                                                                                  | <sup>1</sup> 470,000                          |                     | 470,000          |           | 470,000                |           | 470,000                |           |
| <b>INDIANA</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |                                               |                     |                  |           |                        |           |                        |           |
| (FC)                                     | Brookville Reservoir                                                                                            |                                               | 165,000             |                  | 165,000   |                        | 165,000   |                        | 165,000   |
|                                          | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)                                                         |                                               |                     |                  |           | 500,000                |           | 665,000                |           |
| (N)                                      | Carmelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                   | <sup>1</sup> 11,600,000                       |                     | 11,600,000       |           | 11,600,000             |           | 11,600,000             |           |
| (FC)                                     | Evansville                                                                                                      | <sup>1</sup> 900,000                          |                     | 900,000          |           | 900,000                |           | 900,000                |           |

Footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)                                                                                 | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Senate allowance    |                 | Conference allowance |                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                                                                                 | Construction<br>(2)                              | Planning<br>(3) | Construction<br>(4) | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)  | Planning<br>(9) |
| INDIANA—continued                                                                                                               |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Huntington Reservoir                                                                                                       | \$2,800,000                                      |                 | \$2,800,000         |                 | \$2,800,000         |                 | \$2,800,000          |                 |
| Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification,<br>pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)                                    |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Island levee, Indiana and Illinois                                                                                         |                                                  | \$38,000        |                     | \$38,000        |                     | \$38,000        |                      | \$38,000        |
| (FC) Levee unit 5, Wabash River                                                                                                 | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) (Mason J. Niblack levee)                                                                                                   | 170,000                                          |                 | 170,000             |                 | 170,000             |                 | 170,000              |                 |
| McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.<br>(See Kentucky.)                                                                 |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Mississinewa Reservoir                                                                                                     | 6,000,000                                        |                 | 6,000,000           |                 | 6,000,000           |                 | 6,000,000            |                 |
| (FC) (Monroe Reservoir)                                                                                                         | 1,649,000                                        |                 | 1,649,000           |                 | 1,649,000           |                 | 1,649,000            |                 |
| (N) Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                                |                                                  | 110,000         | 2,100,000           |                 | 2,100,000           |                 | 2,100,000            |                 |
| (FC) Salamonie Reservoir                                                                                                        | 5,500,000                                        |                 | 5,500,000           |                 | 5,500,000           |                 | 5,500,000            |                 |
| (N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky                                                                               | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| IOWA                                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Central City Reservoir (deferred)                                                                                          |                                                  |                 |                     | 60,000          |                     | 60,000          |                      | 60,000          |
| (FC) Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge                                                                                      | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC) Des Moines                                                                                                                 | 200,000                                          |                 | 200,000             |                 | 200,000             |                 | 200,000              |                 |
| (FC) Dubuque                                                                                                                    |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (FC) (Floyd River and tributaries)                                                                                              | 3,221,000                                        |                 | 3,221,000           |                 | 3,299,000           |                 | 3,299,000            |                 |
| (FC) Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2                                                                                | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC) Indian Creek Dam                                                                                                           | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| (FC) Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16                                                                               | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas,<br>Missouri, and Nebraska                                                | 4,000,000                                        |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000            |                 |
| (N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa,<br>Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.                                                                                           | 3,500,000                                        |                 | 3,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000            |                 |
| (b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City                                                                                                | 2,700,000                                        |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,800,000           |                 | 4,800,000            |                 |
| (c) Kansas City to the mouth                                                                                                    | 3,500,000                                        |                 | 3,500,000           |                 | 3,500,000           |                 | 3,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-<br>Louisa County Drainage District No. 13                                   |                                                  |                 | 100,000             |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Rathbun Reservoir                                                                                                          | 1,750,000                                        |                 | 1,750,000           |                 | 1,750,000           |                 | 1,750,000            |                 |
| (FC) Red Rock Reservoir                                                                                                         | 16,500,000                                       |                 | 16,500,000          |                 | 16,500,000          |                 | 16,500,000           |                 |
| (FC) Saylorville Reservoir                                                                                                      | 1,200,000                                        |                 | 1,200,000           |                 | 1,200,000           |                 | 1,200,000            |                 |
| KANSAS                                                                                                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Atchison                                                                                                                   |                                                  | 160,000         |                     | 160,000         |                     | 160,000         |                      | 160,000         |
| (FC) Big Hill Reservoir                                                                                                         |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (FC) Cedar Point Reservoir                                                                                                      |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     | 50,000          |                      |                 |
| (FC) Clinton Reservoir                                                                                                          |                                                  | 240,000         |                     | 240,000         |                     | 240,000         |                      | 240,000         |
| (FC) (Council Grove Reservoir)                                                                                                  | 688,000                                          |                 | 688,000             |                 | 688,000             |                 | 688,000              |                 |
| (FC) Elk City Reservoir                                                                                                         | 7,500,000                                        |                 | 7,500,000           |                 | 7,500,000           |                 | 7,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) Fort Scott Reservoir                                                                                                       |                                                  |                 |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (FC) (John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir)                                                                                          | 1,288,000                                        |                 | 1,288,000           |                 | 1,288,000           |                 | 1,288,000            |                 |
| (FC) Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)                                                                                     |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (FC) Lawrence                                                                                                                   | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| (FC) Marion Reservoir                                                                                                           | 2,700,000                                        |                 | 2,700,000           |                 | 3,000,000           |                 | 3,000,000            |                 |
| (FC) Marysville                                                                                                                 |                                                  | 200,000         |                     |                 | 200,000             |                 | 200,000              |                 |
| (FC) Melvern Reservoir                                                                                                          |                                                  | 230,000         |                     | 230,000         |                     | 230,000         |                      | 230,000         |
| (FC) Merriam                                                                                                                    |                                                  | 40,000          |                     | 40,000          |                     | 40,000          |                      | 40,000          |
| (FC) Milford Reservoir                                                                                                          | 16,000,000                                       |                 | 16,000,000          |                 | 16,000,000          |                 | 16,000,000           |                 |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas,<br>Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                                        |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa,<br>Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                                      |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Perry Reservoir                                                                                                            | 8,500,000                                        |                 | 6,500,000           |                 | 8,500,000           |                 | 8,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) Topeka                                                                                                                     | 4,500,000                                        |                 | 4,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000           |                 | 4,500,000            |                 |
| (FC) Wilson Reservoir                                                                                                           | 2,900,000                                        |                 | 2,900,000           |                 | 3,000,000           |                 | 2,900,000            |                 |
| KENTUCKY                                                                                                                        |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.                                                                                                 | 15,400,000                                       |                 | 15,400,000          |                 | 15,400,000          |                 | 15,400,000           |                 |
| (FC) Bellevue (deferred) and Dayton (inactive)                                                                                  |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     | 25,000          |                      | 25,000          |
| (FC) Booneville Reservoir                                                                                                       |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Ken-<br>tucky. (See Indiana.)                                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N) (Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam,<br>Kentucky and Ohio)                                                               | 4,636,000                                        |                 | 6,365,000           |                 | 6,365,000           |                 | 6,365,000            |                 |
| (FC) Carr Fork Reservoir                                                                                                        | 1,830,000                                        | 10              | 830,000             |                 | 830,000             |                 | 830,000              |                 |
| (FC) Cave Run Reservoir                                                                                                         | 1,300,000                                        |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000            |                 |
| (FC) (Cumberland)                                                                                                               | 490,000                                          |                 | 490,000             |                 | 490,000             |                 | 490,000              |                 |
| (FC) Eagle Creek Reservoir                                                                                                      |                                                  | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                      | 150,000         |
| (FC) Fishtrap Reservoir                                                                                                         | 10,400,000                                       |                 | 18,000,000          |                 | 18,000,000          |                 | 18,000,000           |                 |
| (FC) Frankfort                                                                                                                  |                                                  | 130,000         |                     | 130,000         |                     | 130,000         |                      | 130,000         |
| (FC) Grayson Reservoir                                                                                                          | 4,200,000                                        |                 | 4,200,000           |                 | 4,200,000           |                 | 4,200,000            |                 |
| (FC) Green River Reservoir                                                                                                      | 14,000,000                                       |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000            |                 |
| (MP) Laurel River Reservoir                                                                                                     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (N) McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville) Indiana<br>and Kentucky                                                                 | 2,800,000                                        |                 | 2,800,000           |                 | 2,800,000           |                 | 2,800,000            |                 |
| Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.<br>(See Indiana.)                                                                 |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC) Red River Reservoir                                                                                                        |                                                  | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                     | 150,000         |                      | 150,000         |
| (FC) Sturgis                                                                                                                    |                                                  |                 |                     | 75,000          |                     | 75,000          |                      | 75,000          |
| Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Ken-<br>tucky. (See Indiana.)                                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| LOUISIANA                                                                                                                       |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N) Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Geor-<br>gia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina,<br>South Carolina, and Texas | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (N) Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Water-<br>way                                                                            | 800,000                                          |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
| (N) Calcasieu River and Pass                                                                                                    | 4,000,000                                        |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 5,000,000           |                 | 5,000,000            |                 |
| (N) Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier                                                                                          | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (FC) Campti Clarence levee                                                                                                      | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC) Comite (small flood control, sec. 205)                                                                                     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |

Footnotes at end of table.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1) |                                                                                                            | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Senate allowance    |                 | Conference allowance |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                 |                                                                                                            | Construction<br>(2)                              | Planning<br>(3) | Construction<br>(4) | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)  | Planning<br>(9) |
| LOUISIANA—continued                             |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | East Point levee.....                                                                                      | (4)                                              |                 |                     |                 | (4)                 |                 | (4)                  |                 |
| (N)                                             | Freshwater Bayou.....                                                                                      | \$1,400,000                                      |                 | \$1,400,000         |                 | \$1,400,000         |                 | \$1,400,000          |                 |
| (N)                                             | Mississippi River, gulf outlet.....                                                                        | 8,750,000                                        |                 | 8,750,000           |                 | 9,250,000           |                 | 9,250,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act).....                                                 | 750,000                                          |                 | 750,000             |                 | 750,000             |                 | 750,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)                                                    |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| MAINE                                           |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel.....                                                                      | 1,700,000                                        |                 | 1,700,000           |                 | 1,850,000           |                 | 1,850,000            |                 |
|                                                 | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)                                |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| MARYLAND                                        |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Baltimore Harbor and Channel.....                                                                          | 3,300,000                                        |                 | 3,300,000           |                 | 3,500,000           |                 | 3,500,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.....                                                                  |                                                  | \$350,000       |                     | \$350,000       |                     | \$350,000       |                      | \$350,000       |
|                                                 | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)   |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| MASSACHUSETTS                                   |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Boston Harbor, Chelsea River.....                                                                          | 550,000                                          |                 | 550,000             |                 | 550,000             |                 | 550,000              |                 |
| (R)                                             | Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge.....                                                                         | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | (Chilcote Falls).....                                                                                      | 620,000                                          |                 | 620,000             |                 | 620,000             |                 | 620,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Conant Brook Reservoir.....                                                                                | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Gloucester Harbor).....                                                                                   | 830,000                                          |                 | 830,000             |                 | 830,000             |                 | 830,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | (Littleville Reservoir).....                                                                               | 1,936,000                                        |                 | 1,936,000           |                 | 1,936,000           |                 | 1,936,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | Marblehead Harbor.....                                                                                     |                                                  |                 |                     | 50,000          |                     | 50,000          |                      | 50,000          |
| (FC)                                            | New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier.....                                                            | 4,000,000                                        |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Three Rivers.....                                                                                          | 435,000                                          |                 | 435,000             |                 | 435,000             |                 | 435,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Wareham-Marion.....                                                                                        |                                                  | 75,000          |                     | 100,000         |                     | 75,000          |                      | 75,000          |
| (FC)                                            | Westfield.....                                                                                             | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| MICHIGAN                                        |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (R)                                             | Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments).....                                                              | 150,000                                          |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Gladstone Harbor).....                                                                                    | 617,000                                          |                 | 617,000             |                 | 617,000             |                 | 617,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Great Lakes connecting channels.....                                                                       | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | Leland Harbor.....                                                                                         |                                                  |                 |                     | 30,000          |                     | 30,000          |                      | 30,000          |
| (R)                                             | (Ludington Harbor, north revetment).....                                                                   | 172,000                                          |                 | 172,000             |                 | 172,000             |                 | 172,000              |                 |
| (R)                                             | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment).....                                                                  | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (R)                                             | Marquette Harbor.....                                                                                      | 150,000                                          |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Muskegon Harbor).....                                                                                     | 560,000                                          |                 | 560,000             |                 | 560,000             |                 | 560,000              |                 |
| (R)                                             | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments).....                                                  | 150,000                                          |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | New Buffalo Harbor.....                                                                                    |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     | 50,000          |                      | 50,000          |
| (N)                                             | Ontonagon Harbor.....                                                                                      |                                                  | 91,000          |                     | 91,000          |                     | 91,000          |                      | 91,000          |
| (FC)                                            | Rouge River.....                                                                                           |                                                  | 178,000         |                     | 400,000         |                     | 400,000         |                      | 400,000         |
| (N)                                             | St. Marys River: New Plock lock.....                                                                       | 5,500,000                                        |                 | 5,500,000           |                 | 5,500,000           |                 | 5,500,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Saginaw River (flood control).....                                                                         | 750,000                                          |                 | 750,000             |                 | 750,000             |                 | 750,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Saginaw River (navigation).....                                                                            |                                                  | 120,000         |                     | 120,000         |                     | 120,000         |                      | 120,000         |
| MINNESOTA                                       |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: Inner harbor, 27- and 23-foot channels.....                        | 675,000                                          |                 | 675,000             |                 | 675,000             |                 | 675,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | (Lost River).....                                                                                          | 250,000                                          |                 | 250,000             |                 | 250,000             |                 | 250,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Minnesota River, 9-foot channel.....                                                                       | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (R)                                             | (Reservoirs at headquarters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls))..... | 235,000                                          |                 | 235,000             |                 | 235,000             |                 | 235,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Rushford.....                                                                                              |                                                  | 80,000          |                     | 80,000          |                     | 80,000          |                      | 80,000          |
| (FC)                                            | St. Paul and South St. Paul.....                                                                           | 600,000                                          |                 | 600,000             |                 | 600,000             |                 | 600,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Winona.....                                                                                                | 800,000                                          |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
| MISSISSIPPI                                     |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                    |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FO)                                            | Jackson and East Jackson.....                                                                              |                                                  |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir.....                                                                             | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Pascagoula Harbor).....                                                                                   | 620,000                                          |                 | 620,000             |                 | 620,000             |                 | 620,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)                                                |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi.....                                              |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000              |                 |
| MISSOURI                                        |                                                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Chariton River.....                                                                                        | 650,000                                          |                 | 650,000             |                 | 650,000             |                 | 650,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Hannibal.....                                                                                              |                                                  | 155,000         |                     | 155,000         |                     | 155,000         |                      | 155,000         |
| (MP)                                            | Joanna Reservoir.....                                                                                      |                                                  | 434,000         |                     | 434,000         |                     | 434,000         |                      | 434,000         |
| (MP)                                            | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir.....                                                                             | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000            |                 |
| (MP)                                            | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction (Marion County Drainage District).....                     | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Meramec Park Reservoir.....                                                                                | 764,000                                          |                 | 764,000             |                 | 764,000             |                 | 764,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)                           |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                       |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)                    |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1) |                                                                                             | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Senate allowance    |                 | Conference allowance |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                 |                                                                                             | Construction<br>(2)                              | Planning<br>(3) | Construction<br>(4) | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)  | Planning<br>(9) |
| MISSOURI—continued                              |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts, 1, 2, and 5                                      | \$596,000                                        |                 | \$596,000           |                 | \$596,000           |                 | \$596,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | South River Drainage District                                                               | 499,000                                          |                 | 499,000             |                 | 499,000             |                 | 499,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | St. Louis                                                                                   | 10,000,000                                       |                 | 10,000,000          |                 | 10,000,000          |                 | 10,000,000           |                 |
| (MP)                                            | Stockton Reservoir                                                                          | 4,000,000                                        |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000            |                 |
| MONTANA                                         |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Billings (deferred)                                                                         |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     | \$25,000        |                      | \$25,000        |
| (MP)                                            | Libby Reservoir                                                                             |                                                  | \$1,000,000     |                     | \$1,000,000     |                     | 1,000,000       |                      | 1,000,000       |
| NEBRASKA                                        |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Gering Valley                                                                               | 1,400,000                                        |                 | 1,400,000           |                 | 1,400,000           |                 | 1,400,000            |                 |
| (R)                                             | (Harlan County Reservoir, slope protection)                                                 | 1,600,000                                        |                 | 1,600,000           |                 | 1,600,000           |                 | 1,600,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Little Papillion Creek                                                                      |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 80,000              |                 | 80,000               |                 |
|                                                 | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)       |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Norfolk                                                                                     | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Salt Creek and tributaries                                                                  | 3,000,000                                        |                 | 3,000,000           |                 | 3,000,000           |                 | 3,000,000            |                 |
| NEVADA                                          |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Martins Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.                                                    |                                                  | 125,000         |                     | 125,000         |                     | 200,000         |                      | 200,000         |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE                                   |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (BE)                                            | Hampton Beach (1962 act) (reimbursement)                                                    |                                                  |                 | 109,000             |                 | 109,000             |                 | 109,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.                                      | 1,500,000                                        |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000           |                 | 1,500,000            |                 |
| NEW JERSEY                                      |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (R)                                             | (Cold Spring Inlet (jetties))                                                               | 488,000                                          |                 | 488,000             |                 | 488,000             |                 | 488,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Delaware River Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania     | 3,750,000                                        |                 | 3,750,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 3,750,000            |                 |
|                                                 |                                                                                             | 90,000                                           |                 | 90,000              |                 | 90,000              |                 | 90,000               |                 |
| (R)                                             | (Manasquan River (bulkheads))                                                               | 1,132,000                                        |                 | 1,132,000           |                 | 1,132,000           |                 | 1,132,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel)                            | 264,000                                          |                 | 264,000             |                 | 264,000             |                 | 264,000              |                 |
| (R)                                             | (New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike) New York and New Jersey)           |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 544,000             |                 | 544,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Rahway (small flood control, sec. 395)                                                      | 1,100,000                                        |                 | 1,100,000           |                 | 1,100,000           |                 | 1,100,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays                                                                 |                                                  | 450,000         |                     | 450,000         |                     | 450,000         |                      | 450,000         |
| (MP)                                            | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.                                                        |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| NEW MEXICO                                      |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Albuquerque                                                                                 | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Cochiti Reservoir                                                                           |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 1,000,000           |                 | 1,000,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Galisteo Reservoir                                                                          |                                                  | 192,000         |                     | 192,000         |                     | 192,000         |                      | 192,000         |
| (FC)                                            | Las Cruces                                                                                  |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| NEW YORK                                        |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)                                 |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (N)                                             | Buffalo Harbor: Outer harbor (1962 modification)                                            | 1,406,000                                        |                 | 1,406,000           |                 | 1,406,000           |                 | 1,406,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | (Buttermilk Channel)                                                                        | 1,300,000                                        |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000           |                 | 1,300,000            |                 |
| (BE)                                            | (Fire Island Inlet, Long Island)                                                            | 1,112,000                                        |                 | 1,112,000           |                 | 1,112,000           |                 | 1,112,000            |                 |
| (BE)                                            | Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)                                                 |                                                  |                 |                     | 25,000          |                     | 25,000          |                      | 25,000          |
| (FC)                                            | Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point                                                          | 1,900,000                                        |                 | 1,900,000           |                 | 1,900,000           |                 | 1,900,000            |                 |
| (N)                                             | Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway                                                        | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000             |                 | 400,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Hudson River, New York City to Albany                                                       | 3,200,000                                        |                 | 3,200,000           |                 | 3,500,000           |                 | 3,200,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet                                                                        | 800,000                                          |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Lackawanna                                                                                  | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000             |                 | 500,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Lake Chautauqua and Chataquo River                                                          |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (R)                                             | Little Sodus Bay (piers)                                                                    | 215,000                                          |                 | 215,000             |                 | 215,000             |                 | 215,000              |                 |
|                                                 | (New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)) |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Nichols                                                                                     |                                                  | 35,000          |                     | 35,000          |                     | 35,000          |                      | 35,000          |
| (FC)                                            | North Ellenville                                                                            |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     | 50,000          |                      | 50,000          |
| (N)                                             | Oswego Harbor (1962 act)                                                                    | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Rosendale                                                                                   |                                                  | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                     | 100,000         |                      | 100,000         |
| (FC)                                            | Salamanca                                                                                   |                                                  | 75,000          |                     | 75,000          |                     | 75,000          |                      | 75,000          |
| (FC)                                            | (South Amsterdam)                                                                           | 378,000                                          |                 | 378,000             |                 | 378,000             |                 | 378,000              |                 |
| NORTH CAROLINA                                  |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
|                                                 | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection                                                  | 300,000                                          |                 | 300,000             |                 | 678,000             |                 | 678,000              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Masonboro Inlet Jetties                                                                     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 150,000             |                 | 150,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | New Hope Reservoir                                                                          |                                                  | 250,000         |                     | 250,000         |                     | 250,000         |                      | 250,000         |
| (N)                                             | Northeast Cape Fear (sec. 107)                                                              |                                                  |                 | 105,200             |                 | 105,200             |                 | 105,200              |                 |
| (N)                                             | Wilmington Harbor, 33- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)                                         |                                                  | 67,000          |                     | 67,000          |                     | 500,000         |                      | 67,000          |
|                                                 | Wrightsville Beach                                                                          |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 541,000             |                 | 541,000              |                 |
| NORTH DAKOTA                                    |                                                                                             |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Bowman Haley Reservoir                                                                      | 800,000                                          |                 | 800,000             |                 | 1,200,000           |                 | 1,200,000            |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Missouri River Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir                                               | 800,000                                          |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)                                     |                                                  |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Velva                                                                                       |                                                  |                 |                     |                 | 214,000             |                 | 214,000              |                 |

Footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project |                                                                                                            | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |           | House allowance |           | Senate allowance |           | Conference allowance |           |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|                                          |                                                                                                            | Construction                                     | Planning  | Construction    | Planning  | Construction     | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| (1)                                      |                                                                                                            | (2)                                              | (3)       | (4)             | (5)       | (6)              | (7)       | (8)                  | (9)       |
| OHIO                                     |                                                                                                            |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                                                           | \$16,500,000                                     |           | \$16,500,000    |           | \$16,500,000     |           | \$16,500,000         |           |
| (FC)                                     | Big Darby Creek Reservoir                                                                                  | 1,000,000                                        |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Ruck Creek Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | \$77,000  | 730,000         |           | 730,000          |           | 730,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Caesar Creek Reservoir                                                                                     |                                                  | 150,000   |                 | \$150,000 |                  | \$150,000 |                      | \$150,000 |
|                                          | (Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.))                                  |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                      | Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)                          | 1,800,000                                        |           | 1,800,000       |           | 1,800,000        |           | 1,800,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Cleveland Harbor, deepen east basin to 27 to 28 feet (1962 act)                                            |                                                  |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Conneaut Harbor                                                                                            | 1,000,000                                        |           | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Deer Creek Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | East Fork Reservoir                                                                                        |                                                  | 150,000   |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Empire (deferred)                                                                                          |                                                  |           | 25,000          |           | 25,000           |           | 25,000               |           |
| (FC)                                     | Fremont                                                                                                    |                                                  | 130,000   |                 | 130,000   |                  | 130,000   |                      | 130,000   |
| (N)                                      | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                                                             |                                                  | 230,000   |                 | 230,000   |                  | 230,000   |                      | 230,000   |
| (N)                                      | Lorain Harbor                                                                                              | 3,000,000                                        |           | 3,000,000       |           | 3,000,000        |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir                                                                      |                                                  | 99,000    |                 | 99,000    |                  | 99,000    |                      | 99,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Paint Creek Reservoir                                                                                      |                                                  | 116,000   |                 | 116,000   |                  | 116,000   |                      | 116,000   |
| (N)                                      | (Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia)                                                        | 7,539,000                                        |           | 7,539,000       |           | 7,539,000        |           | 7,539,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                                                               | 6,200,000                                        |           | 6,200,000       |           | 6,200,000        |           | 6,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Salt Creek Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | 200,000   |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |
|                                          | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)                                                 |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River                                                                      | 4,100,000                                        |           | 4,100,000       |           | 4,100,000        |           | 4,100,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia                                                         |                                                  | 325,000   |                 | 325,000   |                  | 325,000   |                      | 325,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Youngstown, Crab Creek                                                                                     |                                                  | 25,000    |                 | 25,000    |                  | 25,000    |                      | 25,000    |
| OKLAHOMA                                 |                                                                                                            |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
|                                          | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)                                     |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Birch Reservoir                                                                                            |                                                  | 155,000   |                 | 155,000   |                  | 155,000   |                      | 155,000   |
| (MP)                                     | Broken Bow Reservoir                                                                                       | 4,800,000                                        |           | 4,800,000       |           | 4,800,000        |           | 4,800,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Copan Reservoir                                                                                            |                                                  | 150,000   |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (MP)                                     | (Eufaula Reservoir)                                                                                        | 3,000,000                                        |           | 3,000,000       |           | 3,000,000        |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Hugo Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                  | 150,000   |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Kaw Reservoir                                                                                              |                                                  | 200,000   |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |
| (MP)                                     | Keystone Reservoir                                                                                         | 6,000,000                                        |           | 6,000,000       |           | 6,000,000        |           | 6,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Lufketa Reservoir                                                                                          |                                                  | 25,000    |                 |           |                  | 25,000    |                      | 25,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Optima Reservoir                                                                                           |                                                  | 162,000   |                 | 162,000   |                  | 162,000   |                      | 162,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Pine Creek Reservoir                                                                                       | 3,500,000                                        |           | 3,500,000       |           | 3,500,000        |           | 3,500,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam                                                               | 9,000,000                                        |           | 6,000,000       |           | 9,000,000        |           | 9,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Skiatook Reservoir                                                                                         |                                                  | 225,000   |                 | 225,000   |                  | 225,000   |                      | 225,000   |
| (N)                                      | Webbers Falls lock and dam                                                                                 | 2,500,000                                        |           | 1,000,000       |           | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000            |           |
| OREGON                                   |                                                                                                            |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Applegate Reservoir                                                                                        |                                                  |           |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Bear Creek                                                                                                 | (7)                                              |           |                 |           | (7)              |           | (7)                  |           |
| (FC)                                     | Blue River Reservoir                                                                                       | 2,028,000                                        |           | 2,028,000       |           | 2,028,000        |           | 2,028,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington                 | 2,000,000                                        |           | 2,000,000       |           | 2,500,000        |           | 2,500,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington                                                         |                                                  | 130,000   |                 | 130,000   |                  | 130,000   |                      | 130,000   |
| (R)                                      | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington                                           | 1,500,000                                        |           | 1,500,000       |           | 1,500,000        |           | 1,500,000            |           |
| (N)                                      | (Coos and Millicoma Rivers)                                                                                | 555,000                                          |           | 555,000         |           | 555,000          |           | 555,000              |           |
| (MP)                                     | Cougar Reservoir                                                                                           | 585,000                                          |           | 585,000         |           | 585,000          |           | 585,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Elk Creek Reservoir                                                                                        |                                                  |           |                 |           | 130,000          |           |                      | 130,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Fall Creek Reservoir                                                                                       | 8,500,000                                        |           | 8,500,000       |           | 8,500,000        |           | 8,500,000            |           |
| (MP)                                     | Green Peter Reservoir                                                                                      | 19,500,000                                       |           | 19,500,000      |           | 19,500,000       |           | 19,500,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington                                                               | 72,000,000                                       |           | 72,000,000      |           | 72,000,000       |           | 72,000,000           |           |
| (MP)                                     | Lost Creek Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | 350,000   |                 | 350,000   |                  | 350,000   |                      | 350,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington                                                | 500,000                                          |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Shelton Ditch                                                                                              |                                                  | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (R)                                      | (Tillamook Bay and Harbor)                                                                                 | 500,000                                          |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (FC)                                     | Willamette River Basin bank protection                                                                     | 500,000                                          |           | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Yaquina Bay and Harbor                                                                                     | 1,700,000                                        |           | 1,700,000       |           | 1,700,000        |           | 1,700,000            |           |
| PENNSYLVANIA                             |                                                                                                            |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.                                                                    | 27,000,000                                       |           | 27,000,000      |           | 27,000,000       |           | 27,000,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Aylesworth Creek Reservoir                                                                                 |                                                  | 80,000    |                 | 80,000    |                  | 80,000    |                      | 80,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Beltzville Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | 276,000   |                 | 276,000   |                  | 276,000   |                      | 276,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Blanchard Reservoir                                                                                        |                                                  | 1,000,000 |                 | 1,000,000 |                  | 1,000,000 |                      | 1,000,000 |
| (FC)                                     | Blue Marsh Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Butler                                                                                                     | 762,000                                          |           | 762,000         |           | 762,000          |           | 762,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Curwensville Reservoir                                                                                     | 3,200,000                                        |           | 3,200,000       |           | 3,200,000        |           | 3,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Dam 4, Monongahela River                                                                                   | 3,800,000                                        |           | 3,800,000       |           | 3,800,000        |           | 3,800,000            |           |
|                                          | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Elkland                                                                                                    | 800,000                                          |           | 800,000         |           | 800,000          |           | 800,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Erie Harbor (1962 Mod)                                                                                     |                                                  |           |                 | 25,000    |                  | 25,000    |                      | 25,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Latrobe                                                                                                    | 300,000                                          |           | 300,000         |           | 300,000          |           | 300,000              |           |
| (N)                                      | Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River                                                                   | 5,500,000                                        |           | 5,500,000       |           | 5,500,000        |           | 5,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Muddy Creek Reservoir, Pa.                                                                                 |                                                  | 25,000    |                 | 25,000    |                  | 25,000    |                      | 25,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Raystown Reservoir                                                                                         |                                                  | 700,000   |                 | 700,000   |                  | 700,000   |                      | 700,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Scranton                                                                                                   |                                                  | 45,000    |                 | 45,000    |                  | 45,000    |                      | 45,000    |
| (FC)                                     | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.                                                                     | 11,300,000                                       |           | 11,300,000      |           | 11,300,000       |           | 11,300,000           |           |
| (FC)                                     | Tioga Hammond Reservoir                                                                                    |                                                  | 300,000   |                 | 300,000   |                  | 300,000   |                      | 300,000   |
|                                          | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)                                                     |                                                  |           |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                     | Turtle Creek                                                                                               | 4,500,000                                        |           | 4,500,000       |           | 4,500,000        |           | 4,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                     | Union City Reservoir                                                                                       |                                                  | 100,000   |                 | 100,000   |                  | 100,000   |                      | 100,000   |
| (FC)                                     | Woodcock Reservoir                                                                                         |                                                  | 60,000    |                 | 60,000    |                  | 60,000    |                      | 60,000    |

Footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project                                                                  |                                                                                      | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |          | House allowance |           | Senate allowance |           | Conference allowance |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| (1)                                                                                                       |                                                                                      | Construction                                  | Planning | Construction    | Planning  | Construction     | Planning  | Construction         | Planning  |
| (1)                                                                                                       |                                                                                      | (2)                                           | (3)      | (4)             | (5)       | (6)              | (7)       | (8)                  | (9)       |
| RHODE ISLAND                                                                                              |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Fox Point Barrier).....                                                             | \$1,857,000                                   |          | \$1,857,000     |           | \$1,857,000      |           | \$1,857,000          |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Lower Woonsocket.....                                                                | 2,000,000                                     |          | 2,000,000       |           | 2,000,000        |           | 2,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Narragansett pier, hurricane barrier.....                                            |                                               | \$65,000 |                 | \$65,000  |                  | \$65,000  |                      | \$65,000  |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Point Judith, hurricane barrier.....                                                 |                                               | 100,000  |                 | 120,000   |                  | 120,000   |                      | 120,000   |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Warwick Cove (sec. 107).....                                                         |                                               |          | (200,000)       |           | (200,000)        |           | (200,000)            |           |
| SOUTH CAROLINA                                                                                            |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                   |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| SOUTH DAKOTA                                                                                              |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Big Bend Reservoir.....                                                              | 14,500,000                                    |          | 14,500,000      |           | 14,500,000       |           | 14,500,000           |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Fort Randall Reservoir.....                                                          | 1,270,000                                     |          | 1,270,000       |           | 1,270,000        |           | 1,270,000            |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.....                                              | 4,000,000                                     |          | 4,000,000       |           | 4,000,000        |           | 4,000,000            |           |
| TENNESSEE                                                                                                 |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)                                                                |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Cordell Hull lock and dam.....                                                       | 7,100,000                                     |          | 8,100,000       |           | 8,100,000        |           | 8,100,000            |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | J. Percy Priest Reservoir.....                                                       | 12,100,000                                    |          | 10,100,000      |           | 12,100,000       |           | 12,100,000           |           |
| (BA)                                                                                                      | (Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.).....                                      | 413,000                                       |          | 413,000         |           | 413,000          |           | 413,000              |           |
| TEXAS                                                                                                     |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)                                                                   |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Bardwell Reservoir.....                                                              | 6,500,000                                     |          | 6,500,000       |           | 6,500,000        |           | 6,500,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Big Fossil Creek).....                                                              | 1,340,000                                     |          | 1,340,000       |           | 1,340,000        |           | 1,340,000            |           |
| (R)                                                                                                       | Brazos Island Harbor (jetties).....                                                  | 750,000                                       |          | 750,000         |           | 750,000          |           | 750,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Buffalo Bayou and tributaries.....                                                   | 2,900,000                                     |          | 2,900,000       |           | 2,900,000        |           | 2,900,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Canyon Reservoir).....                                                              | 614,000                                       |          | 614,000         |           | 614,000          |           | 614,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension.....                                       | 200,000                                       |          | 200,000         |           | 200,000          |           | 200,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension.....                                        | 600,000                                       |          | 600,000         |           | 600,000          |           | 600,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Freeport and vicinity.....                                                           | 300,000                                       |          | 300,000         |           | 300,000          |           | 300,000              |           |
| (R)                                                                                                       | Galveston Harbor (jetties).....                                                      | 1,800,000                                     |          | 1,800,000       |           | 1,800,000        |           | 1,800,000            |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project.....                                   | 500,000                                       |          | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | (Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River Channel to Victoria).....               | 2,955,000                                     |          | 2,955,000       |           | 2,955,000        |           | 2,955,000            |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Houston ship channel (40-foot project).....                                          | 3,200,000                                     |          | 3,200,000       |           | 3,200,000        |           | 3,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Lake Kemp Reservoir.....                                                             |                                               | 200,000  |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement.....                            |                                               | 225,000  |                 | 225,000   |                  | 225,000   |                      | 225,000   |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels.....                                | 2,477,000                                     |          | 2,477,000       |           | 2,477,000        |           | 2,477,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Pat Mayse Reservoir.....                                                             |                                               | 300,000  |                 | 1,000,000 |                  | 1,000,000 |                      | 1,000,000 |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola..... | 2,000,000                                     |          | 2,000,000       |           | 2,000,000        |           | 2,000,000            |           |
| (R)                                                                                                       | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties).....                                  | 800,000                                       |          | 800,000         |           | 800,000          |           | 800,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection).....                           |                                               | 389,000  |                 | 389,000   |                  | 389,000   |                      | 389,000   |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)           |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Sabine-Neches Waterway 40-feet and channel to Echo.....                              |                                               |          | 1,500,000       |           | 1,500,000        |           | 1,500,000            |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam.....                                                    | 5,600,000                                     |          | 5,600,000       |           | 5,600,000        |           | 5,600,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | San Antonio Channel.....                                                             | 1,000,000                                     |          | 1,000,000       |           | 1,000,000        |           | 1,000,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | San Gabriel River Tributary to Brazos River.....                                     |                                               | 400,000  |                 | 400,000   |                  | 400,000   |                      | 400,000   |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Somerville Reservoir.....                                                            | 5,200,000                                     |          | 5,200,000       |           | 5,200,000        |           | 5,200,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Stillhouse Hollow Dam.....                                                           | 3,600,000                                     |          | 3,600,000       |           | 3,600,000        |           | 3,600,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Texas City.....                                                                      | 4,300,000                                     |          | 4,300,000       |           | 4,300,000        |           | 4,300,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Vince and Little Vince Bayous.....                                                   |                                               | 99,000   |                 | 99,000    |                  | 99,000    |                      | 99,000    |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Waco Reservoir).....                                                                | 6,326,000                                     |          | 6,326,000       |           | 6,326,000        |           | 6,326,000            |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Wallisville Reservoir.....                                                           |                                               | 350,000  |                 | 350,000   |                  | 350,000   |                      | 350,000   |
| VERMONT                                                                                                   |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Gayville Dam (deferred).....                                                         |                                               |          |                 | 20,000    |                  | 20,000    |                      | 20,000    |
| VIRGINIA                                                                                                  |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Gathright Reservoir.....                                                             |                                               |          |                 | 150,000   |                  | 150,000   |                      | 150,000   |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir.....                                             | 5,000,000                                     |          | 5,000,000       |           | 5,000,000        |           | 5,000,000            |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay.....                                                         |                                               |          | 200,000         |           | 200,000          |           | 200,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Norfolk).....                                                                       | 1,460,000                                     |          | 1,460,000       |           | 1,460,000        |           | 1,460,000            |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | North Fork of Pound Reservoir.....                                                   | 3,000,000                                     |          | 3,000,000       |           | 3,000,000        |           | 3,000,000            |           |
| (BE)                                                                                                      | Virginia Beach (reimbursement).....                                                  | 125,000                                       |          | 125,000         |           | 125,000          |           | 125,000              |           |
| WASHINGTON                                                                                                |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Colfax.....                                                                          | 1,500,000                                     |          | 1,500,000       |           | 1,500,000        |           | 1,500,000            |           |
| Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                         |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2.....               |                                               |          |                 |           | 50,000           |           | 50,000               |           |
| (R)                                                                                                       | Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty).....                                   | 500,000                                       |          | 500,000         |           | 500,000          |           | 500,000              |           |
| John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                               |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Kingston Harbor.....                                                                 |                                               |          |                 |           | 75,000           |           | 75,000               |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Little Goose lock and dam.....                                                       | 13,000,000                                    |          | 13,000,000      |           | 13,000,000       |           | 13,000,000           |           |
| Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)                                |                                                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           |                  |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Lower Granite lock and dam.....                                                      |                                               |          |                 |           | 1,000,000        |           |                      |           |
| (MP)                                                                                                      | Lower Monumental lock and dam.....                                                   | 37,500,000                                    |          | 37,500,000      |           | 37,500,000       |           | 37,500,000           |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | (Sammamish River).....                                                               | 760,000                                       |          | 760,000         |           | 760,000          |           | 760,000              |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | (Swinomish Slough).....                                                              | 790,000                                       |          | 790,000         |           | 790,000          |           | 790,000              |           |
| (N)                                                                                                       | Tacoma Harbor.....                                                                   | 900,000                                       |          | 900,000         |           | 900,000          |           | 900,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Washougal area.....                                                                  | 700,000                                       |          | 700,000         |           | 700,000          |           | 700,000              |           |
| (FC)                                                                                                      | Wynoochee River Reservoir.....                                                       |                                               | 200,000  |                 | 200,000   |                  | 200,000   |                      | 200,000   |

Footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1965—Continued

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1) |                                                                                                                  | Approved budget estimate<br>for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance        |                 | Senate allowance       |                 | Conference allowance   |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                 |                                                                                                                  | Construction<br>(2)                              | Planning<br>(3) | Construction<br>(4)    | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6)    | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)    | Planning<br>(9) |
| WEST VIRGINIA                                   |                                                                                                                  |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Beech Fork Reservoir                                                                                             |                                                  | \$100,000       |                        | \$100,000       |                        | \$150,000       |                        | \$150,000       |
|                                                 | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.<br>(See Ohio.)                                                 |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Birch Reservoir (deferred)                                                                                       |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        | 50,000          |                        | 50,000          |
|                                                 | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See<br>Maryland.)                                                         |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Buckhannon                                                                                                       | \$175,000                                        |                 | \$175,000              |                 | \$175,000              |                 | \$175,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | East Lynn Reservoir                                                                                              | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 |
|                                                 | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.<br>(See Ohio.)                                                   |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Justice Reservoir                                                                                                |                                                  | 650,000         |                        | 650,000         |                        | 650,000         |                        | 650,000         |
| (N)                                             | Opekiska lock and dam                                                                                            | 4,800,000                                        |                 | 4,800,000              |                 | 4,800,000              |                 | 4,800,000              |                 |
|                                                 | (Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia. (See Ohio.))                                               |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
|                                                 | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.<br>(See Ohio.)                                                     |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Summersville Reservoir                                                                                           | 8,244,000                                        |                 | 8,244,000              |                 | 9,000,000              |                 | 9,000,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West<br>Virginia. (See Ohio.)                                               |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| WISCONSIN                                       |                                                                                                                  |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
|                                                 | Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis.<br>(See Minnesota.)                                                      |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Eau Galle River, Spring Valley                                                                                   | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000                |                 | 400,000                |                 | 400,000                |                 |
| (N)                                             | Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)                                                                                      |                                                  | 70,000          |                        | 70,000          |                        | 70,000          |                        | 70,000          |
| (N)                                             | (Kenosha Harbor)                                                                                                 | 335,000                                          |                 | 335,000                |                 | 335,000                |                 | 335,000                |                 |
| (R)                                             | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)                                                                       | 150,000                                          |                 | 150,000                |                 | 150,000                |                 | 150,000                |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Kickapoo River                                                                                                   |                                                  | 125,000         |                        | 125,000         |                        | 125,000         |                        | 125,000         |
| (N)                                             | Milwaukee Harbor (1935 act)                                                                                      | 6,000                                            |                 | 6,000                  |                 | 6,000                  |                 | 6,000                  |                 |
| (N)                                             | Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)                                                                                      | 400,000                                          |                 | 400,000                |                 | 400,000                |                 | 400,000                |                 |
| (R)                                             | Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)                                                                                    | 432,000                                          |                 | 432,000                |                 | 432,000                |                 | 432,000                |                 |
| (N)                                             | Saxon Harbor                                                                                                     |                                                  |                 | 200,000                |                 | 200,000                |                 | 200,000                |                 |
| (R)                                             | (Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal)                                                                          | 147,000                                          |                 | 147,000                |                 | 147,000                |                 | 147,000                |                 |
| MISCELLANEOUS                                   |                                                                                                                  |                                                  |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |                        |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Small projects for flood control and related pur-<br>poses not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)         | 6,000,000                                        |                 | 5,000,000              |                 | 7,758,000              |                 | 7,758,000              |                 |
| (FC)                                            | Snagging and clearing                                                                                            | 250,000                                          |                 | 250,000                |                 | 250,000                |                 | 250,000                |                 |
| (N)                                             | Small navigation projects not requiring specific<br>legislation costing up to \$200,000 (sec. 107)               | 1,500,000                                        |                 | <sup>1</sup> 1,805,200 |                 | <sup>1</sup> 1,949,200 |                 | <sup>1</sup> 1,949,200 |                 |
| (BE)                                            | Small beach erosion control projects not requiring<br>specific legislation costing up to \$400,000 (sec.<br>103) | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 |
|                                                 | Recreation facilities, completed projects                                                                        | 4,000,000                                        |                 | 4,795,000              |                 | 5,000,000              |                 | 5,000,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Small authorized projects                                                                                        | 1,000,000                                        |                 | 1,000,000              |                 | 1,000,000              |                 | 1,000,000              |                 |
|                                                 | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife<br>Service)                                                    | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 |
| (R)                                             | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to<br>\$400,000)                                                       | 500,000                                          |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 | 500,000                |                 |
|                                                 | Employees compensation                                                                                           | 176,000                                          |                 | 176,000                |                 | 176,000                |                 | 176,000                |                 |
|                                                 | Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages                                                                  | -70,000,000                                      |                 | -75,000,000            |                 | -70,000,000            |                 | -70,000,000            |                 |
| Grand total, construction, general              |                                                                                                                  | 878,439,000                                      | 20,669,000      | 884,096,200            | 21,671,000      | 920,327,200            | 22,464,000      | 917,782,200            | 22,161,000      |
|                                                 |                                                                                                                  | (899,108,000)                                    |                 | (905,767,200)          |                 | (942,791,200)          |                 | (939,943,200)          |                 |

<sup>1</sup> Recommendations subsequently made to reprogram the budget amounts as follows:

| State and project                                       | Amount in<br>budget | Revised<br>amount      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| General investigations:                                 |                     |                        |
| Flood control studies:                                  |                     |                        |
| California: Sacramento-San Joaquin region               | \$31,000            | \$20,000               |
| Illinois: Saline River and tributaries                  | 40,000              | 65,000                 |
| Indiana: Crooked Creek at and in vicinity<br>of Madison | 25,000              | 41,000                 |
| Kentucky: Salt River                                    | 40,000              | 65,000                 |
| Utah: Price River                                       | 20,000              |                        |
| Subtotal, general investigations                        | 156,000             | 191,000                |
| Construction, general:                                  |                     |                        |
| Advance engineering and design:                         |                     |                        |
| Alabama: Tennessee-Tombigbee Water-<br>way              |                     | 100,000                |
| Illinois: Saline River and tributaries                  |                     | 75,000                 |
| Kentucky:                                               |                     |                        |
| Carr Fork Reservoir                                     | <sup>a</sup> 70,000 | <sup>b</sup> (830,000) |
| Red River Reservoir                                     | 100,000             | 150,000                |
| New York: Nichols                                       |                     | 35,000                 |
| Ohio:                                                   |                     |                        |
| Caesar Creek Reservoir                                  | 100,000             | 150,000                |
| East Fork Reservoir                                     | 100,000             | 150,000                |
| Salt Creek Reservoir                                    | 100,000             | 200,000                |
| Pennsylvania:                                           |                     |                        |
| Muddy Creek Reservoir                                   |                     | 25,000                 |
| Tioga-Hammond Reservoir                                 |                     | 300,000                |
| Raystown Reservoir                                      | 300,000             | 700,000                |
| Subtotal, advance engineering and<br>design             | 770,000             | 1,885,000              |

| State and project                                                                                  | Amount in<br>budget   | Revised<br>amount    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Construction, general—Continued.                                                                   |                       |                      |
| Construction:                                                                                      |                       |                      |
| California: Crescent City Harbor (re-<br>habilitation)                                             | \$300,000             |                      |
| Florida: Port Everglades Harbor (1958<br>act)                                                      | 2,254,000             | \$1,254,000          |
| Illinois:                                                                                          |                       |                      |
| Calumet River bridges                                                                              | 2,000,000             | 1,300,000            |
| Tri Pond levee                                                                                     | 700,000               | 470,000              |
| Indiana:                                                                                           |                       |                      |
| Cannelton locks and dams, Indiana<br>and Kentucky                                                  | 12,000,000            | 11,600,000           |
| Evansville                                                                                         | 700,000               | 900,000              |
| Levee unit No. 5, Wabash River                                                                     | 1,200,000             | 1,500,000            |
| Iowa: Muscatine Island Levee District<br>and Muscatine Louisa County Drain-<br>age District No. 13 | 100,000               |                      |
| Kentucky:                                                                                          |                       |                      |
| Carr Fork Reservoir                                                                                | <sup>a</sup> (70,000) | <sup>b</sup> 830,000 |
| Green River Reservoir                                                                              | 3,200,000             | 4,000,000            |
| Missouri: Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir                                                                |                       | 1,500,000            |
| New Jersey: Cold Spring Inlet (rehabili-<br>tation)                                                | 1,078,000             | 488,000              |
| New York:                                                                                          |                       |                      |
| Buttermilk Channel                                                                                 | 1,700,000             | 1,300,000            |
| Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point                                                                 | 2,440,000             | 1,900,000            |
| Ohio: Big Darby Reservoir                                                                          | 750,000               | 1,000,000            |
| Oregon: John Day River                                                                             | 400,000               |                      |
| Pennsylvania:                                                                                      |                       |                      |
| Curwensville Reservoir                                                                             | 3,000,000             | 3,200,000            |
| Turtle Creek                                                                                       | 5,000,000             | 4,500,000            |



| State and project                       | Amount in budget | Revised amount |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Construction, general—Continued.</b> |                  |                |
| Construction—Continued                  |                  |                |
| West Virginia:                          |                  |                |
| Opekiska lock and dam.....              | \$5,200,000      | \$4,800,000    |
| Summersville Reservoir.....             | 7,914,000        | 8,244,000      |
| Subtotal, construction.....             | 49,936,000       | 48,786,000     |
| Grand total, reprogramming.....         | 50,862,000       | 50,862,000     |

\* Planning funds to be taken out of budget.

\* All construction funds.

<sup>2</sup> Recommendations subsequently made as follows (S. Doc. 90, July 29, 1964):

| State and project                                                                     | From—        | To—          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: Navigation locks and dams..... | \$42,000,000 | \$51,500,000 |
| Central and southern Florida flood control project.....                               | 13,500,000   | 13,800,000   |
| Perry Reservoir, Kans.....                                                            | 6,500,000    | 8,500,000    |
| Wareham-Marion, Mass.....                                                             | 100,000      | 75,000       |
| Lukfata Reservoir, Okla.....                                                          |              | 25,000       |
| Robert S. Kerr lock and dam, Oklahoma.....                                            | 6,000,000    | 9,000,000    |
| Webbers Falls lock and dam, Oklahoma.....                                             | 1,000,000    | 2,500,000    |
| J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn.....                                                  | 8,600,000    | 12,100,000   |

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. ELLENDER. For Mississippi River and tributaries, the conference report provides \$77,862,000, which is \$2,058,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$4,312,000 above the House;

\$6,002,000 above the budget; and the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation explaining the action of the

conferees on the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1965

| Construction, general, State and project<br>(1)      | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 |                 | House allowance     |                 | Senate allowance    |                 | Conference allowance |                 |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                                                      | Construction<br>(2)                           | Planning<br>(3) | Construction<br>(4) | Planning<br>(5) | Construction<br>(6) | Planning<br>(7) | Construction<br>(8)  | Planning<br>(9) |
| 1. General investigations:                           |                                               |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| (a) Examinations and surveys.....                    | \$65,000                                      |                 | \$90,000            |                 | \$125,000           |                 | \$125,000            |                 |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data.....          | 85,000                                        |                 | 85,000              |                 | 85,000              |                 | 85,000               |                 |
| Subtotal, general investigations.....                | 150,000                                       |                 | 175,000             |                 | 210,000             |                 | 210,000              |                 |
| 2. Construction and planning:                        |                                               |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| Mississippi River levees.....                        | 3,800,000                                     |                 | 3,800,000           |                 | 4,000,000           |                 | 4,000,000            |                 |
| Channel improvement.....                             | 24,500,000                                    |                 | 26,165,000          |                 | 27,250,000          |                 | 26,892,000           |                 |
| Memphis Harbor.....                                  | 600,000                                       |                 | 600,000             |                 | 600,000             |                 | 600,000              |                 |
| Old River control.....                               | 200,000                                       |                 | 200,000             |                 | 200,000             |                 | 200,000              |                 |
| St. Francis Basin.....                               | 3,700,000                                     |                 | 3,700,000           |                 | 3,700,000           |                 | 3,700,000            |                 |
| West Tennessee tributaries.....                      | 1,400,000                                     |                 | 1,400,000           |                 | 1,400,000           |                 | 1,400,000            |                 |
| Lower Arkansas River.....                            | 300,000                                       |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| Tensas Basin:                                        |                                               |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.....                    | 900,000                                       |                 | 900,000             |                 | 900,000             |                 | 900,000              |                 |
| Rcd River backwater.....                             | 200,000                                       |                 | 200,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| Yazoo Basin:                                         |                                               |                 |                     |                 |                     |                 |                      |                 |
| Sardis Reservoir.....                                | 70,000                                        |                 | 70,000              |                 | 70,000              |                 | 70,000               |                 |
| Enid Reservoir.....                                  | 40,000                                        |                 | 40,000              |                 | 40,000              |                 | 40,000               |                 |
| Arkabutla Reservoir.....                             | 40,000                                        |                 | 40,000              |                 | 40,000              |                 | 40,000               |                 |
| Grenada Reservoir.....                               | 50,000                                        |                 | 50,000              |                 | 50,000              |                 | 50,000               |                 |
| Greenwood.....                                       | 700,000                                       |                 | 700,000             |                 | 700,000             |                 | 700,000              |                 |
| Upper auxiliary channels.....                        | 100,000                                       |                 | 100,000             |                 | 100,000             |                 | 100,000              |                 |
| Main stem.....                                       | 800,000                                       |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000             |                 | 800,000              |                 |
| Tributaries.....                                     | 1,600,000                                     |                 | 1,600,000           |                 | 1,600,000           |                 | 1,600,000            |                 |
| Big Sunflower River, etc.....                        | 650,000                                       |                 | 650,000             |                 | 650,000             |                 | 650,000              |                 |
| Yazoo backwater.....                                 | 1,850,000                                     |                 | 1,850,000           |                 | 2,000,000           |                 | 2,000,000            |                 |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries.....                  | 300,000                                       |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000             |                 | 300,000              |                 |
| Atchafalaya Basin.....                               | 7,200,000                                     |                 | 7,200,000           |                 | 10,000,000          |                 | 8,600,000            |                 |
| Lake Pontchartrain.....                              | 210,000                                       |                 | 210,000             |                 | 210,000             |                 | 210,000              |                 |
| Subtotal, construction and planning.....             | 49,210,000                                    |                 | 50,875,000          |                 | 55,210,000          |                 | 53,452,000           |                 |
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages..... | -1,500,000                                    |                 | -1,500,000          |                 | -1,500,000          |                 | -1,500,000           |                 |
| Total, construction and planning.....                | 47,710,000                                    |                 | 49,375,000          |                 | 53,710,000          |                 | 51,952,000           |                 |
| 3. Maintenance.....                                  | 24,000,000                                    |                 | 24,000,000          |                 | 26,000,000          |                 | 25,700,000           |                 |
| Grand total.....                                     | 71,860,000                                    |                 | 73,550,000          |                 | 79,920,000          |                 | 77,862,000           |                 |

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to Title II: Bureau of Reclamation, Construction, and Rehabilitation, the conference bill provides \$185,616,500 for this item, which is \$72,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; \$3,183,-

500 above the amount allowed by the House; \$292,500 above the budget; and \$185,500 above the appropriation for 1964. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a tabu-

lation showing the action of the conferees on this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

\* Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small navigation projects (sec. 107) and included in tentative list for fiscal year 1965.

\* Recommendations subsequently made to amend the budget as follows (H. Doc. 240; Mar. 9, 1964):

| State and project                                                    | From—     | To—         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Construction, general:                                               |           |             |
| Advance engineering and design, Washington: Pullman.....             | \$146,000 | 0           |
| Construction:                                                        |           |             |
| Kentucky: Capt. Anthony Meldahi lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio..... | 6,885,000 | \$6,365,000 |
| New York: South Amsterdam.....                                       | 512,000   | 378,000     |
| Total.....                                                           | 7,543,000 | 6,743,000   |

\* Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small flood control projects (sec. 206), but not included in tentative list of projects for fiscal year 1965.

\* The additional funds allowed by the House were earmarked as follows:

Northeast Cape Fear, N.C., \$105,200.

Warwick County, R.I., \$200,000.

\* Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects and included in tentative list of small authorized projects for fiscal year 1965.

NOTE.—Projects shown in *italics* are new projects or modifications of projects on which construction has not started, and projects in parentheses are those projects to be completed with the amount in the approved budget.



## Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

| Project                                                                                      | Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance | Project                                             | Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Delivery of water to Mexico                                                                  |                 |                 | \$2,000,000      | \$2,000,000          | Riverton project, 3d division, Wyoming              | \$1,300,000     | \$1,300,000     | \$1,300,000      | \$1,300,000          |
| Malta, Mont., street improvement                                                             |                 |                 | 26,000           | 26,000               | Drainage and minor construction                     | 1,412,964       | 1,412,964       | 1,412,964        | 1,412,964            |
| Advance planning                                                                             | \$200,000       | \$200,000       | 200,000          | 200,000              | Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects  | 4,544,251       | 4,144,251       | 4,144,251        | 4,144,251            |
| Gila project, Arizona                                                                        | 1,190,000       | 1,190,000       | 1,190,000        | 1,190,000            | Reclamation office building                         |                 |                 | 2,650,000        | 2,650,000            |
| Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California                                    | 4,265,000       | 4,665,000       | 4,665,000        | 4,665,000            | Subtotal                                            | 132,422,015     | 128,856,015     | 137,732,015      | 137,682,015          |
| Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada                                              | 1,482,000       | 1,482,200       | 1,482,000        | 1,482,000            | Missouri River Basin project:                       |                 |                 |                  |                      |
| Central Valley project, California                                                           | 55,546,000      | 55,280,000      | 54,480,000       | 54,480,000           | Ainsworth unit, Nebraska                            | 6,500,000       | 6,500,000       | 6,500,000        | 6,500,000            |
| Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie                                                 | 3,300,000       |                 | 3,300,000        | 3,300,000            | Almena unit, Kansas                                 | 1,350,000       | 2,200,000       | 2,200,000        | 2,200,000            |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado                                                         | 6,200,000       | 6,200,000       | 6,200,000        | 6,200,000            | East Bench unit, Montana                            | 780,000         | 780,000         | 780,000          | 780,000              |
| Mann Creek project, Idaho                                                                    | 725,000         | 225,000         | 725,000          | 725,000              | Farwell unit, Nebraska                              | 2,700,000       | 2,700,000       | 2,700,000        | 2,700,000            |
| Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas                                                     | 1,480,000       | 1,480,000       | 1,480,000        | 1,480,000            | Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska              | 665,000         | 665,000         | 665,000          | 665,000              |
| Arbuckle project, Oklahoma                                                                   | 3,500,000       | 3,500,000       | 3,500,000        | 3,500,000            | Glen Elder unit, Kansas                             | 8,400,000       | 8,400,000       | 8,400,000        | 8,400,000            |
| Norman project, Oklahoma                                                                     | 3,221,000       | 3,221,000       | 3,221,000        | 3,221,000            | Transmission division                               | 22,175,000      | 22,175,000      | 21,585,000       | 21,585,000           |
| Baker project, upper division, Oregon                                                        | 700,000         | 700,000         | 700,000          | 700,000              | Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming                    | 19,950,000      | 19,950,000      | 19,950,000       | 19,950,000           |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg.                   | 400,000         | 400,000         | 400,000          | 400,000              | Drainage and minor construction                     | 1,915,000       | 1,915,000       | 1,915,000        | 1,915,000            |
| The Dalles project, western division, Oregon                                                 | 2,393,800       | 2,393,800       | 2,393,800        | 2,393,800            | Investigations                                      | 1,743,000       | 1,668,000       | 1,893,000        | 1,893,000            |
| Canadian River project, Texas                                                                | 22,100,000      | 22,100,000      | 22,100,000       | 22,100,000           | Advance planning                                    | 950,000         | 850,000         | 850,000          | 850,000              |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas                            | 783,000         | 783,000         | 783,000          | 783,000              | Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project              | 67,128,000      | 67,803,000      | 67,438,000       | 67,438,000           |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas                            | 775,000         | 775,000         | 775,000          | 775,000              | Other Department of the Interior agencies           | 3,349,000       | 3,349,000       | 3,394,000        | 3,371,500            |
| Weber Basin project, Utah                                                                    | 7,786,000       | 7,786,000       | 7,986,000        | 7,986,000            | Total, Missouri River Basin project                 | 70,477,000      | 71,152,000      | 70,832,000       | 70,809,500           |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville, Tonasket unit, Washington | 400,000         | 400,000         | 400,000          | 400,000              | Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation           | 202,899,015     | 200,008,015     | 208,564,015      | 208,491,515          |
| Columbia Basin project, Washington                                                           | 6,800,000       | 6,800,000       | 8,300,000        | 8,300,000            | Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays | -17,575,015     | -17,575,015     | -22,875,015      | -22,875,015          |
| Spokane Valley project, Washington                                                           | 1,918,000       | 1,918,000       | 1,918,000        | 1,918,000            | Total, construction and rehabilitation              | 185,324,000     | 182,433,000     | 185,689,000      | 185,616,500          |

Mr. ELLENDER. As to title III, very little change was made by the conferees. As Senators know, that title deals with the Atomic Energy Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the record a table showing the details of the amount agreed to by the conferees for operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

| Program                                              | Budget estimate | Conference allowance |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Raw materials                                        | \$267,455,000   | \$267,455,000        |
| Special nuclear materials                            | 401,500,000     | 398,500,000          |
| Weapons                                              | 771,747,000     | 765,000,000          |
| Reactor development                                  | 497,900,000     | 494,000,000          |
| Physical research                                    | 222,000,000     | 214,000,000          |
| Biology and medicine                                 | 80,000,000      | 78,000,000           |
| Training, education, and information                 | 17,700,000      | 15,700,000           |
| Isotopes development program                         | 10,300,000      | 9,300,000            |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives          | 11,000,000      | 11,000,000           |
| Community program                                    | 9,035,000       | 9,035,000            |
| Program direction and administration                 | 76,780,000      | 76,000,000           |
| Security investigation program                       | 7,000,000       | 7,000,000            |
| Cost of work for others                              | 5,100,000       | 5,100,000            |
| Change in selected resources                         | -18,451,000     | -21,451,000          |
| Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources | -36,066,000     | -47,066,000          |
| Unobligated balance brought forward                  |                 | -20,000,000          |
| Total                                                | 2,323,000,000   | 2,261,573,000        |

Mr. ELLENDER. Title IV provides funds for the TVA, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for accelerated public works.

I have already submitted to the Senate the table indicating exactly what was done as to each agency in that title.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

*Resolved*, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11579) entitled "An Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 13, 14, and 16 to aforesaid bill, and concur therein.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$150,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING, URBAN RENEWAL, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3049) to

extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which was as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Housing Act of 1964'."

#### "TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

##### "Mortgage limit for homes under section 203 programs

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$25,000', '\$27,500', '\$27,500', and '\$35,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$30,000', '\$32,500', '\$32,500', and '\$37,500', respectively; and

"(2) by striking out '90 per centum', '90 per centum', and '75 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '92 per centum', '92½ per centum', and '80 per centum', respectively.

"(b) Section 203(i) of such Act is amended by striking out '\$90,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$11,000'."

##### "Home improvement loans outside of urban renewal areas

"Sec. 102. Section 203(k) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'economically sound' in clause (2) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'an acceptable risk'."

##### "Additional relief for home mortgagors in default due to circumstances beyond their control

"Sec. 103. (a) Section 204(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the fourth proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'And provided further, That with respect to any mortgage covering a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence insured under this Act, if the Commissioner finds, after notice of default, that the default was due to circumstances beyond the control of the mortgagor, he may, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, (1) approve the request of the mortgagor for an extension of the time for the curing of the default and of the time for



The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EQUAL TREATMENT IN PAYMENT OF PER DIEM

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, be further amended by inserting the following at the end of the fifth sentence thereof: "The term 'permanent station' may also include the home of a member upon order or call to or relief from active duty, active duty for training, or full time duty performed under the provisions of section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32, United States Code."*

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 404(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word 'and' at the end of clause (2), striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in place thereof the word 'and', and adding the following new clause:

"(4) when away from home to perform duty, including duty to be performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States in his status as a member

of the National Guard, for which he is entitled to, or has waived, pay under this title."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10328) for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all payments of uniform allowances made prior to the date of enactment of this Act under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 255), to distinguished military graduates of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who were ordered to active duty as commissioned officers of a reserve component of the Army or Air Force while being considered for appointment in the Regular Army or Regular Air Force, are hereby validated. Any such officer or former officer who has made repayment to the United States of any amount so paid to him as uniform allowance is entitled to have refunded to him the amount repaid.*

SEC. 2. Appropriations available to the

military departments for the pay and allowances of officer personnel shall be available for payments under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11579) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 13, 1964.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report figure is \$4,430,794,700 as contained in this bill. It provides for the appropriation of \$23,554,000 over the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year. This figure is about \$10 million below the budget estimate for the year 1965.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

##### Summary table

| Item                                                            | Appropriations, 1964       | Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended) | Passed House     | Passed Senate    | Conference action | Conference action compared with— |                 |                |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
|                                                                 |                            |                                    |                  |                  |                   | Appropriations, 1964             | Budget estimate | Passed House   | Passed Senate |
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL                             |                            |                                    |                  |                  |                   |                                  |                 |                |               |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY                                          |                            |                                    |                  |                  |                   |                                  |                 |                |               |
| CEMETERIAL EXPENSES                                             |                            |                                    |                  |                  |                   |                                  |                 |                |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                      | \$10, 800, 000             | \$13, 295, 000                     | \$13, 295, 000   | \$13, 295, 000   | \$13, 295, 000    | +\$2, 495, 000                   |                 |                |               |
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL                                        |                            |                                    |                  |                  |                   |                                  |                 |                |               |
| General investigations-----                                     | 19, 115, 000               | <sup>1</sup> 19, 795, 000          | 20, 590, 000     | 22, 269, 000     | 22, 194, 000      | +3, 079, 000                     | +\$2, 399, 000  | +\$1, 604, 000 | —\$75, 000    |
| Construction, general-----                                      | 827, 146, 500              | <sup>2</sup> 899, 108, 000         | 905, 767, 200    | 942, 791, 200    | 939, 943, 200     | +112, 796, 700                   | +40, 835, 200   | +34, 176, 200  | —2, 548, 000  |
| Operation and maintenance, general-----                         | <sup>3</sup> 155, 700, 000 | 158, 676, 000                      | 158, 676, 000    | 158, 676, 000    | 158, 676, 000     | +2, 976, 000                     |                 |                |               |
| Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies----- | (4)                        | 4, 150, 000                        | 4, 150, 000      | 4, 150, 000      | 4, 150, 000       | +4, 150, 000                     |                 |                |               |
| General expenses-----                                           | 15, 000, 000               | 15, 575, 000                       | 15, 575, 000     | 15, 575, 000     | 15, 575, 000      | +575, 000                        |                 |                |               |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries-----           | 77, 862, 000               | 71, 800, 000                       | 73, 550, 000     | 79, 920, 000     | 77, 862, 000      |                                  | +6, 002, 000    | +4, 312, 000   | —2, 058, 000  |
| U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers-----  | 10, 000                    |                                    |                  |                  |                   | —10, 000                         |                 |                |               |
| Total, rivers and harbors and flood control-----                | 1, 094, 833, 500           | <sup>21</sup> 1, 169, 164, 000     | 1, 178, 308, 200 | 1, 223, 381, 200 | 1, 218, 400, 200  | +123, 566, 700                   | +49, 236, 200   | +40, 092, 000  | —4, 981, 000  |

Footnotes at end of table.



## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—Continued

## Summary table—Continued

| Item                                                                                    | Appropriations, 1964       | Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended) | Passed House  | Passed Senate | Conference action | Conference action compared with— |                 |               |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                                                                         |                            |                                    |               |               |                   | Appropriations, 1964             | Budget estimate | Passed House  | Passed Senate |
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL—Con.                                                |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Con.                                                             |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| THE PANAMA CANAL                                                                        |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Canal Zone Government:                                                                  |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Operating expenses.....                                                                 | \$25,725,000               | <sup>1</sup> \$29,088,000          | \$29,088,000  | \$29,088,000  | \$29,088,000      | \$+3,363,000                     | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Capital outlay.....                                                                     | 6,500,000                  | 4,821,000                          | 4,821,000     | 4,821,000     | 4,821,000         | -1,679,000                       | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses.....                | (9,285,000)                | (10,639,000)                       | (10,639,000)  | (10,639,000)  | (10,639,000)      | (+1,354,000)                     | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, the Panama Canal.....                                                            | 32,225,000                 | 33,909,000                         | 33,909,000    | 33,909,000    | 33,909,000        | +1,684,000                       | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, title I.....                                                                     | <sup>2</sup> 1,137,858,500 | <sup>2</sup> 1,216,368,000         | 1,225,512,200 | 1,270,585,200 | 1,265,604,200     | +127,745,700                     | +\$49,236,200   | +\$40,092,000 | -\$4,981,000  |
| TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR                                                     |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| NATIONAL PARK SERVICE                                                                   |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Construction (supplemental, 1965).....                                                  |                            | <sup>5</sup> (1,800,000)           | -----         | 1,800,000     | 1,800,000         | +1,800,000                       | +1,800,000      | +1,800,000    | -----         |
| BUREAU OF RECLAMATION                                                                   |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| General investigations.....                                                             | 10,294,000                 | 10,500,000                         | 10,354,000    | 12,404,000    | 11,404,000        | +1,110,000                       | +904,000        | +1,050,000    | -1,000,000    |
| Construction and rehabilitation.....                                                    | 185,431,000                | <sup>6</sup> 185,324,000           | 182,433,000   | 185,689,000   | 185,616,500       | +185,500                         | +292,500        | +3,183,500    | -72,500       |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                                          | <sup>7</sup> 37,697,000    | <sup>8</sup> 40,219,000            | 40,219,000    | 40,219,000    | 40,219,000        | +2,522,000                       | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                                               | (4,020,000)                | (4,269,000)                        | (4,269,000)   | (4,269,000)   | (4,269,000)       | (+249,000)                       | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Loan program.....                                                                       | 12,367,000                 | <sup>6</sup> 12,307,000            | 12,307,000    | 12,307,000    | 12,307,000        | -60,000                          | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Emergency fund.....                                                                     |                            |                                    |               | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000         | +1,000,000                       | +1,000,000      | +1,000,000    | -----         |
| Upper Colorado River Basin fund.....                                                    | 97,989,200                 | 62,300,000                         | 62,300,000    | 62,300,000    | 62,300,000        | -35,689,200                      | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| General administrative expenses.....                                                    | 10,000,000                 | 10,400,000                         | 10,400,000    | 10,400,000    | 10,400,000        | +400,000                         | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....                                                       | 353,778,200                | 321,050,000                        | 318,013,000   | 324,319,000   | 323,246,500       | -30,531,700                      | +2,196,500      | +5,233,500    | -1,072,500    |
| BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION                                                         |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Construction.....                                                                       | 36,204,000                 | <sup>10</sup> 89,020,000           | 41,220,000    | 87,420,000    | 87,420,000        | +51,216,000                      | -1,600,000      | +46,200,000   | -----         |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                                          | <sup>9</sup> 13,840,000    | 14,980,000                         | 14,980,000    | 14,980,000    | 14,980,000        | +1,140,000                       | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....                                             | <sup>9</sup> 50,044,000    | 104,000,000                        | 56,200,000    | 102,400,000   | 102,400,000       | +52,356,000                      | -1,600,000      | +46,200,000   | -----         |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION                                                       |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                                          | 1,000,000                  | 1,000,000                          | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000     | 1,000,000         | -----                            | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION                                                       |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Construction.....                                                                       | 3,000,000                  | 2,770,000                          | 2,610,000     | 2,610,000     | 2,610,000         | -390,000                         | -160,000        | -----         | -----         |
| Operation and maintenance.....                                                          | 1,500,000                  | 1,680,000                          | 1,680,000     | 1,680,000     | 1,680,000         | +180,000                         | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....                             | (4,500,000)                | (4,500,000)                        | (4,500,000)   | (4,500,000)   | (4,500,000)       | -----                            | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....                                           | 4,500,000                  | 4,450,000                          | 4,290,000     | 4,290,000     | 4,290,000         | -210,000                         | -160,000        | -----         | -----         |
| Total, definite appropriations.....                                                     | 409,322,200                | 430,500,000                        | 379,503,000   | 433,809,000   | 432,736,500       | +23,414,300                      | +2,236,500      | -----         | -----         |
| Total, indefinite appropriations.....                                                   | 8,520,000                  | 8,769,000                          | 8,769,000     | 8,769,000     | 8,769,000         | +249,000                         | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, title II.....                                                                    | 417,842,200                | 439,269,000                        | 388,272,000   | 442,578,000   | 441,505,500       | +23,663,300                      | +2,236,500      | +53,233,500   | -1,072,500    |
| TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION                                                      |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Operating expenses.....                                                                 | 2,342,669,000              | 2,323,000,000                      | 2,261,073,000 | 2,268,008,000 | 2,268,573,000     | -81,096,000                      | -61,427,000     | +500,000      | -6,435,000    |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....                                               | (31,574,000)               | (36,066,000)                       | (36,066,000)  | (47,066,000)  | (47,066,000)      | (+15,492,000)                    | (+11,000,000)   | (+11,000,000) | -----         |
| Plant and capital equipment.....                                                        | 400,000,000                | 370,000,000                        | 363,000,000   | 363,000,000   | 363,000,000       | -37,000,000                      | -7,000,000      | -----         | -----         |
| Total, Atomic Energy Commission.....                                                    | 2,742,669,000              | 2,693,000,000                      | 2,624,073,000 | 2,631,008,000 | 2,624,573,000     | -118,096,000                     | -68,427,000     | +500,000      | -6,435,000    |
| Total, definite appropriation.....                                                      | 2,742,669,000              | 2,693,000,000                      | 2,624,073,000 | 2,631,008,000 | 2,624,573,000     | -118,096,000                     | -68,427,000     | +500,000      | -6,435,000    |
| Total, indefinite appropriation.....                                                    | 31,574,000                 | 36,066,000                         | 36,066,000    | 47,066,000    | 47,066,000        | +15,492,000                      | +11,000,000     | +11,000,000   | -----         |
| Total, title III.....                                                                   | 2,774,243,000              | 2,729,066,000                      | 2,660,139,000 | 2,678,074,000 | 2,671,639,000     | -102,604,000                     | -57,427,000     | -11,500,000   | -6,435,000    |
| TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES                                                            |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses..... | (429,000)                  | (450,000)                          | (450,000)     | (450,000)     | (450,000)         | (+21,000)                        | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Tennessee Valley Authority.....                                                         | 47,142,000                 | 50,915,000                         | 47,915,000    | 47,915,000    | 47,915,000        | +773,000                         | -3,000,000      | -----         | -----         |
| Delaware River Basin Commission:                                                        |                            |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                              | 38,000                     | 39,000                             | 39,000        | 39,000        | 39,000            | +1,000                           | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission.....                                | 117,000                    | 92,000                             | 92,000        | 92,000        | 92,000            | -25,000                          | -----           | -----         | -----         |
| Total, Delaware River Basin Commission.....                                             | 155,000                    | 131,000                            | 131,000       | 131,000       | 131,000           | -24,000                          | -----           | -----         | -----         |

Footnotes at end of table.



## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—Continued

## Summary table—Continued

| Item                                   | Appropriations, 1964 | Budget estimate, 1965 (as amended) | Passed House  | Passed Senate | Conference action | Conference action compared with— |                 |               |               |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                        |                      |                                    |               |               |                   | Appropriations, 1964             | Budget estimate | Passed House  | Passed Senate |
| TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued |                      |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT    |                      |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Public works acceleration.....         | \$30,000,000         | \$5,000,000                        | \$4,000,000   | \$4,000,000   | \$4,000,000       | —\$26,000,000                    | —\$1,000,000    | -----         | -----         |
| Total, title IV.....                   | 77,297,000           | 56,046,000                         | 52,046,000    | 52,046,000    | 52,046,000        | —25,251,000                      | —4,000,000      | -----         | -----         |
| Grand totals:                          |                      |                                    |               |               |                   |                                  |                 |               |               |
| Total, definite appropriations.....    | 4,367,146,700        | 4,395,914,000                      | 4,281,134,200 | 4,387,448,200 | 4,374,959,700     | +7,813,000                       | —20,954,300     | +\$93,825,500 | -----         |
| Total, indefinite appropriations....   | 40,094,000           | 44,835,000                         | 44,835,000    | 55,835,000    | 55,835,000        | +15,741,000                      | +11,000,000     | +11,000,000   | -----         |
| Grand total, all titles.....           | 4,407,240,700        | 4,440,749,000                      | 4,325,969,200 | 4,443,283,200 | 4,430,794,700     | +23,544,000                      | —9,954,300      | +104,825,500  | —\$12,488,500 |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects increase in H. Doc. No. 309.<sup>2</sup> Reflects reduction in H. Doc. No. 240: H. Doc. No. 309; and increase of \$19,800,000 in S. Doc. No. 90.<sup>3</sup> Includes \$1,700,000 in Public Law No. 88-317.<sup>4</sup> Funds for this activity were included with "Operation and maintenance, general" appropriation in fiscal year 1964.<sup>5</sup> To be financed by transfer from "Construction and rehabilitation," Bureau of Reclamation.<sup>6</sup> Reflects decrease of \$706,000 in H. Doc. No. 309, and increase of \$3,300,000 in S. Doc. No. 89.<sup>7</sup> Reflects transfer to Bureau of Land Management of \$303,000 in Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1964.<sup>8</sup> Reflects reduction of \$81,000 in H. Doc. No. 240.<sup>9</sup> Include \$340,000 in Public Law No. 88-317.<sup>10</sup> Reflects increase of \$45,200,000 in S. Doc. No. 89.

## (CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATION)

## Projects included in increases above the House figure

|                                                                                   | House allowance | Allocation of Senate increase |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES</b>                                                      |                 |                               |
| Alabama: Flint River.....                                                         |                 | +\$10,000                     |
| Arizona: Gila and Salt Rivers, Salt River from Maxwell Dam site to the mouth..... |                 | +30,000                       |
| California:                                                                       |                 |                               |
| Mad River, Calif.....                                                             |                 | +15,000                       |
| Sacramento River and Butte Basin, Calif.....                                      |                 | +20,000                       |
| Florida:                                                                          |                 |                               |
| Martin County.....                                                                | \$50,000        | +30,000                       |
| South New River Canal.....                                                        |                 | +20,000                       |
| Idaho: Portneuf River and tributaries.....                                        |                 | +35,000                       |
| Indiana: Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio.....                                         | 30,000          | +10,000                       |
| Iowa: Nishnabotna River Valley.....                                               | 50,000          | +10,000                       |
| Kansas: Arkansas River, Hutchinson-Cimarron, Kans. and Okla.....                  | 50,000          | +10,000                       |
| Kentucky: Southwestern Jefferson County.....                                      |                 | +20,000                       |
| Louisiana: Ouachita River, Columbia, La.....                                      |                 | +10,000                       |
| Mississippi:                                                                      |                 |                               |
| Town Creek at Jackson, Miss                                                       |                 | +20,000                       |
| Tombigbee River at Columbus, including Luxapalila Creek, Miss.....                |                 | +35,000                       |
| Nebraska: Papillion Creek.....                                                    | 50,000          | +50,000                       |
| Nevada: Truckee Meadows.....                                                      | 25,000          | +25,000                       |
| North Carolina:                                                                   |                 |                               |
| Neuse River, N.C.....                                                             |                 | +20,000                       |
| Northeast Cape Fear River, N.C.....                                               |                 | +15,000                       |
| Ohio: Muskingum River Basin.....                                                  | 70,000          | +20,000                       |
| Oregon:                                                                           |                 |                               |
| Beaver Creek.....                                                                 | 5,000           | +5,000                        |
| Yaquina River.....                                                                | 5,000           | +5,000                        |
| South Dakota: Cheyenne and Belle Fourche Rivers, S. Dak. and Wyo.....             |                 | +10,000                       |
| Texas: Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas.....                                  |                 | +75,000                       |
| Utah: Mill and Pack Creeks-Moab, Utah.....                                        | 50,000          | +15,000                       |
| Virginia: James River, Lynchburg.....                                             | 50,000          | +10,000                       |
| <b>NAVIGATION STUDIES</b>                                                         |                 |                               |
| Alaska:                                                                           |                 |                               |
| Auke Bay.....                                                                     |                 | +15,000                       |
| Kobuk River.....                                                                  |                 | +10,000                       |
| California:                                                                       |                 |                               |
| Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor.....                                                |                 | +25,000                       |
| Sunset Harbor.....                                                                |                 | +15,000                       |
| Connecticut:                                                                      |                 |                               |
| New London Harbor.....                                                            |                 | +10,000                       |
| Thames River.....                                                                 |                 | +10,000                       |

## Projects included in increases above the House figure—Continued

|                                                                                                 | House allowance | Allocation of Senate increase |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>NAVIGATION STUDIES—continued</b>                                                             |                 |                               |
| Florida:                                                                                        |                 |                               |
| Central and southern Florida navigation locks.....                                              |                 | +16,000                       |
| Intercoastal Waterway, St. Marks River to Tampa Bay.....                                        | 80,000          | +20,000                       |
| Georgia: Brunswick Harbor.....                                                                  |                 | +50,000                       |
| Hawaii: Coast of Hawaiian Islands.....                                                          |                 | +56,000                       |
| Idaho: Asotin lock, Idaho and Washington.....                                                   |                 | +20,000                       |
| Louisiana:                                                                                      |                 |                               |
| Atchafalaya River, Bayou Chene, Bayou Boeuf, and Bayou Black.....                               |                 | +10,000                       |
| Barataria Bay Waterway.....                                                                     |                 | +10,000                       |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, east of Mississippi River-gulf outlet and in the Michoud Canal..... |                 | +15,000                       |
| Maryland:                                                                                       |                 |                               |
| Choptank River.....                                                                             |                 | +10,000                       |
| Crisfield Harbor.....                                                                           |                 | +10,000                       |
| Michigan:                                                                                       |                 |                               |
| Detroit River, Trenton Channel.....                                                             |                 | +15,000                       |
| Lake Erie coast, Michigan and Ohio.....                                                         | 25,000          | +5,000                        |
| Mississippi: Biloxi Harbor.....                                                                 |                 | +24,000                       |
| New Jersey:                                                                                     |                 |                               |
| Cape May-Lewes Crossing, N.J. and Del.....                                                      |                 | +20,000                       |
| New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Shrewsbury River to Delaware Bay.....                         | 25,000          | +15,000                       |
| New York: East River, N.Y., South Brother Island.....                                           |                 | +19,000                       |
| North Carolina:                                                                                 |                 |                               |
| Hatteras Inlet.....                                                                             |                 | +15,000                       |
| Pamlico River.....                                                                              |                 | +20,000                       |
| Ohio:                                                                                           |                 |                               |
| Cleveland Harbor (drift removal).....                                                           |                 | +10,000                       |
| Lake Erie coast, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York.....                                          | 60,000          | +10,000                       |
| Rhode Island: Bessell Cove.....                                                                 |                 | +20,000                       |
| Virginia: Drift removal, Hampton Roads and Norfolk Harbor.....                                  | 12,000          | +12,000                       |
| Washington:                                                                                     |                 |                               |
| Everett Harbor.....                                                                             |                 | +15,000                       |
| Neah Bay.....                                                                                   |                 | +15,000                       |

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this conference report I would simply like to say that this is a most difficult bill to handle, the public works ap-

propriation bill. As the Members of the House know, every State in the Union has items in this bill and is greatly interested in what happens to the public works appropriation bill, as well as possibly half of the Members of Congress. The Members of Congress are interested in the bill because they have projects contained in the bill which are located in their respective districts.

Mr. Speaker, we have reduced the budget estimate by almost \$10 million. That represents no small chore. Many of the most conservative Members of this House and of the Congress come before our committee and ask that we appropriate more money for projects which are located in their respective districts. It is not an easy matter or a pleasant duty to deny many of those demands or requests.

Mr. Speaker, had we accepted all of the requests of the hundreds of Members of Congress who came before our committee, this bill would possibly be a quarter of a billion dollars more than it is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can only compliment our good chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the other members of the committee, as well as the clerks of the committee, for a job well done.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

(Mr. PILLION asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House at this time that this report represents a very equitable settlement of the differences between the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for the effective way in which he represented the position of the House in the conference with the Senate. He was chief trial lawyer at that conference.



He handled the matter in a straightforward way and very effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of the House to know this.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 11579, the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1965. This bill is always referred to outside of Congress as the pork-barrel bill. The allusion is that the bill provides taxpayers' money for unneeded and wasteful projects, that it is fattened by politics, and that it is a gigantic boondoggle.

I say that the programs and projects that come from public works and reclamation are an investment in America. They preserve our land and conserve our natural resources. If it had not been for these programs this great Nation of ours would be stripped bare by the ravages of storms, the rapaciousness of furious flooding rivers, the savage winds, and driving rains. It would lie wasted by the ferociousness of forest fires, and floods, and, sometimes too often, by the greed of man. These projects contain the elements and enable the river, the rains, the harbors, and the mountains to work for mankind, and not against mankind.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress that sits on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, I have been invited and have traveled to many places in the United States to join in groundbreaking and dedication ceremonies. And, incidentally, none have given me a greater sense of personal pride and satisfaction than those I have been invited to in my own native New England, and particularly in my own Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. Only last Saturday, August 8, I was supposed to attend the groundbreaking ceremony for the Conant Brook Dam and Reservoir in Monson, Mass., in my district, but

had to cancel out because of the vote on the poverty bill in the House that day. This project is an integral unit in the flood protection plan for the Chicopee River Basin, and the larger Connecticut River Valley Basin.

When Hurricane Diane struck with devastating force on August 19, 1955, and caused \$21,500,000 in property damage in the Chicopee River Basin, I was sitting as a new member of the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. During the 10 years that I have sat on this important subcommittee, I am happy that the flood control program for all of New England has moved ahead with speed and effectiveness. New England has suffered from great floods and hurricanes, in 1936, 1938, 1944, 1954, and 1955, and I take pride in the part that I have played to guarantee an adequate flood control protection for the New England area. Great and important strides have been made during these last 10 years to give protection to the lives and property of the people in New England from the terrible ravages of flood and savage waters. Yes, indeed, we have come a long way since the Congress

made it a policy of national import in 1936 to assist the States and local communities in public works projects constructed to control the rivers, streams, and harbors.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to have inserted with my remarks at this point in the RECORD a summary table and detailed project lists containing information concerning the flood control and hurricane protection program in the New England region. The lists indicate by river basins those projects in the New England division, Army Corps of Engineers, jurisdictional boundaries, which were completed between 1936 and 1954; projects completed from the time of Hurricane Diane in 1955 to 1964; projects currently under design; active authorized projects; authorized projects presently in the "deferred projects" category; and survey reports being processed for congressional consideration. They also reflect the latest available information on individual project cost estimates, status, and the Federal appropriations to date. The bill before us today provides the following appropriations for fiscal year 1965 in Massachusetts:

| Construction, general, State and project        | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1965 (as amended) |          | Conference allowance |          |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
|                                                 | Construction                                      | Planning | Construction         | Planning |
| Massachusetts:                                  |                                                   |          |                      |          |
| (N) Boston Harbor, Chelsea River                | \$550,000                                         | -----    | \$550,000            | -----    |
| (R) Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge               | 500,000                                           | -----    | 500,000              | -----    |
| (FC) Chicopee Falls                             | 620,000                                           | -----    | 620,000              | -----    |
| (FC) Conant Brook Reservoir                     | 1,000,000                                         | -----    | 1,000,000            | -----    |
| (N) Gloucester Harbor                           | 830,000                                           | -----    | 830,000              | -----    |
| (FC) Littleville Reservoir                      | 1,936,000                                         | -----    | 1,936,000            | -----    |
| (N) Marblehead Harbor                           |                                                   |          |                      | \$50,000 |
| (FC) New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier | 4,000,000                                         | -----    | 4,000,000            | -----    |
| (FC) Three Rivers                               | 435,000                                           | -----    | 435,000              | -----    |
| (FC) Warcham-Marion                             |                                                   | \$75,000 |                      | 75,000   |
| (FC) Westfield                                  | 300,000                                           | -----    | 300,000              | -----    |

Mr. Speaker, the tables I referred to above follow:

*Flood control and hurricane program (projects) New England*

I. FLOOD CONTROL

| River basin                                                     | Number of reservoirs | Number of Local protection | Federal cost | Non-Federal cost | Total cost   | Federal appropriations through fiscal year 1964 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| A. Completed prior to August 1955:                              |                      |                            |              |                  |              |                                                 |
| Connecticut                                                     | 5                    | 9                          | \$35,368,400 | \$4,705,300      | \$40,073,700 | \$34,602,700                                    |
| Merrimack                                                       | 3                    | 4                          | 15,949,200   | 213,300          | 16,162,500   | 15,949,200                                      |
| Thames                                                          | 1                    | 0                          | 6,447,000    | 0                | 6,447,000    | 6,406,000                                       |
| Coastal                                                         | 0                    | 1                          | 52,200       | 2,800            | 55,000       | 52,200                                          |
| Total                                                           | 9                    | 14                         | 57,816,800   | 4,921,400        | 62,738,200   | 57,010,100                                      |
| B. Completed since August 1955 or presently under construction: |                      |                            |              |                  |              |                                                 |
| Blackstone                                                      | 1                    | 3                          | 18,118,000   | 4,102,000        | 22,220,000   | 12,580,800                                      |
| Connecticut                                                     | 9                    | 8                          | 57,643,000   | 2,319,400        | 59,962,400   | 51,405,200                                      |
| Housatonic                                                      | 5                    | 3                          | 25,934,300   | 1,755,300        | 27,689,600   | 23,367,300                                      |
| Merrimack                                                       | 1                    | 1                          | 21,220,000   | 0                | 21,220,000   | 21,175,400                                      |
| Thames                                                          | 5                    | 1                          | 27,623,600   | 72,000           | 27,695,600   | 23,705,900                                      |
| Coastal                                                         | 0                    | 4                          | 523,800      | 102,100          | 625,900      | 523,800                                         |
| Total                                                           | 21                   | 20                         | 151,062,700  | 8,350,800        | 159,413,500  | 132,758,400                                     |
| C. Under design:                                                |                      |                            |              |                  |              |                                                 |
| Connecticut                                                     | 2                    | 1                          | 20,800,000   | 1,680,000        | 22,480,000   | 963,000                                         |
| Housatonic                                                      | 2                    | 1                          | 17,605,000   | 425,000          | 18,030,000   | 485,000                                         |
| Total                                                           | 4                    | 2                          | 38,405,000   | 2,105,000        | 40,510,000   | 1,448,000                                       |
| D. Future (authorized, recommended or deferred):                |                      |                            |              |                  |              |                                                 |
| Connecticut                                                     | 4                    | 0                          | 39,800,000   | 1,200,000        | 41,000,000   | 415,000                                         |
| Housatonic                                                      | 0                    | 2                          | 5,600,000    | 930,000          | 6,530,000    | -----                                           |
| Total                                                           | 4                    | 2                          | 45,400,000   | 2,130,000        | 47,530,000   | 415,000                                         |
| Total flood control                                             | 38                   | 38                         | 202,684,500  | 17,507,200       | 310,191,700  | 191,631,500                                     |



## Flood control and hurricane program (projects) New England—Continued

## II. HURRICANE (ALL SINCE 1955)

| River basin                          | Number of reservoirs | Number of Local protection | Federal cost | Non-Federal cost | Total cost   | Federal appropriations through fiscal year 1964 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Completed or under construction..... |                      | 4                          | \$30,286,500 | \$16,413,500     | \$46,700,000 | \$16,687,500                                    |
| Under design.....                    |                      | 5                          | 12,262,000   | 5,738,000        | 18,000,000   | 246,800                                         |
| Future, authorized.....              |                      | 1                          | 1,750,000    | 750,000          | 2,500,000    |                                                 |
| Recommended.....                     |                      | 2                          | 8,150,000    | 3,760,000        | 11,910,000   |                                                 |
| Total hurricane.....                 |                      | 12                         | 52,448,500   | 26,661,500       | 79,110,000   | 16,934,300                                      |
| Total program.....                   | 38                   | 50                         | 345,133,000  | 44,168,700       | 389,301,700  | 208,565,800                                     |

## I. FLOOD CONTROL

## A. PROJECT COMPLETED PRIOR TO 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

| Project                               | Completion date | Federal cost | Non-Federal cost | Total    | Federal appropriations through fiscal year 1964 | Project                           | Completion date | Federal cost | Non-Federal cost | Total    | Federal appropriations through fiscal year 1964 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN</b>        |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 | <b>MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN</b>      |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| <b>Dams and reservoirs:</b>           |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 | <b>Dams and reservoirs:</b>       |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Birch Hill Reservoir, Mass.....       | 1942            | 4,440.0      | 0                | 4,440.0  | 4,179.9                                         | Blackwater, N.H.....              | 1941            | 1,319.7      | 0                | 1,319.7  | 1,319.7                                         |
| Knightsville, Mass.....               | 1941            | 3,220.4      | 0                | 3,220.4  | 3,220.4                                         | Edward MacDowell, N.H.....        | 1950            | 2,014.3      | 0                | 2,014.3  | 2,014.3                                         |
| Surry Mountain, N.H.....              | 1942            | 2,550.0      | 0                | 2,550.0  | 2,392.8                                         | Franklin Falls, N.H.....          | 1943            | 7,947.2      | 0                | 7,947.2  | 7,947.2                                         |
| Tully, Mass.....                      | 1949            | 1,900.0      | 0                | 1,900.0  | 1,551.6                                         | Subtotal.....                     |                 | 11,281.2     | 0                | 11,281.2 | 11,281.2                                        |
| Union Village, Vt.....                | 1950            | 4,010.7      | 0                | 4,010.7  | 4,010.7                                         | Local protection projects:        |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Subtotal.....                         |                 | 16,121.1     | 0                | 16,121.1 | 15,355.4                                        | Fitchburg, Mass.....              | 1938            | 1,370.0      | 0                | 1,370.0  | 1,370.0                                         |
| <b>Local protection projects:</b>     |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 | Haverhill, Mass.....              | 1938            | 1,743.0      | 120.0            | 1,863.0  | 1,743.0                                         |
| Chilcopee, Mass.....                  | 1941            | 1,433.6      | 250.0            | 1,683.6  | 1,433.6                                         | Lowell, Mass.....                 | 1944            | 1,285.0      | 90.0             | 1,375.0  | 1,285.0                                         |
| East Hartford, Conn.....              | 1943            | 2,135.5      | 270.0            | 2,405.5  | 2,135.5                                         | Nashua, N.H.....                  | 1948            | 270.0        | 3.3              | 273.3    | 270.0                                           |
| Hartford, Conn.....                   | 1949            | 6,457.2      | 3,440.9          | 9,898.1  | 6,457.2                                         | Subtotal.....                     |                 | 4,688.0      | 213.3            | 4,881.3  | 4,668.0                                         |
| Holyoke-Springfield, Mass.....        | 1950            | 4,118.0      | 207.0            | 4,325.0  | 4,118.0                                         | Total, Merrimack River Basin..... |                 | 15,949.2     | 213.3            | 16,162.5 | 15,949.2                                        |
| Keene, N.H. <sup>2</sup> .....        | 1954            | 44.1         | 0                | 44.1     | 44.1                                            | <b>THAMES RIVER BASIN</b>         |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Northampton, Mass.....                | 1941            | 960.0        | 150.0            | 1,110.0  | 960.0                                           | <b>Dams and reservoirs:</b>       |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Springfield, Mass.....                | 1941            | 1,136.4      | 277.4            | 1,413.8  | 1,136.4                                         | Mansfield Hollow, Conn.....       | 1952            | 6,447.0      | 0                | 6,447.0  | 6,406.0                                         |
| West Springfield-Riverdale, Mass..... | 1950            | 2,717.0      | 80.0             | 2,797.0  | 2,717.0                                         | <b>COSTAL RIVER BASIN</b>         |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Winsted, Conn.....                    | 1951            | 245.5        | 30.0             | 275.5    | 245.5                                           | <b>Local protection projects:</b> |                 |              |                  |          |                                                 |
| Subtotal.....                         |                 | 19,247.3     | 4,705.3          | 23,952.6 | 19,247.3                                        | Norwalk, Conn. <sup>2</sup> ..... | 1951            | 52.2         | 2.8              | 55.0     | 52.2                                            |
| Total, Connecticut River Basin.....   |                 | 35,368.4     | 4,705.3          | 40,073.7 | 34,602.7                                        | Grand total, A.....               |                 | 57,816.8     | 4,921.4          | 62,738.2 | 57,010.1                                        |

## B. COMPLETED SINCE AUGUST 1955 (C) OR PRESENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION (UC)

|                                     |      |          |         |          |          |                                          |      |          |         |          |          |
|-------------------------------------|------|----------|---------|----------|----------|------------------------------------------|------|----------|---------|----------|----------|
| <b>BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN</b>       |      |          |         |          |          | <b>Local protection projects:</b>        |      |          |         |          |          |
| <b>Dams and Reservoirs:</b>         |      |          |         |          |          | <b>Chicopee Falls, Mass. (UC).....</b>   |      |          |         |          |          |
| West Hill, Mass. (C).....           | 1961 | 2,300.0  | 0       | 2,300.0  | 2,286.8  | Gardner, Mass. <sup>2</sup> .....        | 1965 | 2,290.0  | 510.0   | 2,800.0  | 1,455.0  |
| <b>Local protection projects:</b>   |      |          |         |          |          | Hartford (Folly Brook), Conn. (C).....   | 1957 | 382.4    | 251.6   | 634.0    | 382.4    |
| Lower Woonsocket, R.I. (UC).....    | 1966 | 6,838.0  | 2,312.0 | 9,150.0  | 1,314.0  | Huntington, Mass. <sup>2</sup> (C).....  | 1959 | 6.0      | 0       | 6.0      | 6.0      |
| Woonsocket (Upper), R.I. (C).....   | 1960 | 4,040.0  | 769.0   | 4,809.0  | 4,040.0  | Three Rivers, Mass. (UC).....            | 1965 | 1,400.0  | 725.0   | 2,125.0  | 810.0    |
| Worcester Diversion, Mass. (C)..... | 1960 | 4,940.0  | 1,021.0 | 5,961.0  | 4,940.0  | Ware, Mass. <sup>2</sup> (C).....        | 1959 | 400.0    | 85.0    | 485.0    | 400.0    |
| Subtotal.....                       |      | 15,818.0 | 4,102.0 | 19,920.0 | 10,294.0 | Weston, Vt. (C).....                     | 1957 | 13.0     | 1.8     | 14.8     | 13.0     |
| Total, Blackstone River Basin.....  |      | 18,118.0 | 4,102.0 | 22,220.0 | 12,580.8 | West Warren, Mass. <sup>2</sup> (C)..... | 1963 | 389.0    | 41.0    | 430.0    | 389.0    |
| <b>CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN</b>      |      |          |         |          |          | Subtotal.....                            |      | 5,300.4  | 1,649.4 | 6,949.8  | 3,577.9  |
| <b>Dams and reservoirs:</b>         |      |          |         |          |          | Total, Connecticut River Basin.....      |      | 57,643.0 | 2,319.4 | 59,962.4 | 51,405.2 |
| Ball Mountain, Vt. (C).....         | 1961 | 10,535.3 | 0       | 10,535.3 | 10,535.3 | <b>HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN</b>            |      |          |         |          |          |
| Barre Falls, Mass. (C).....         | 1958 | 1,967.8  | 0       | 1,967.8  | 1,967.8  | <b>Dams and reservoirs:</b>              |      |          |         |          |          |
| Conant Brook, Mass. (UC).....       | 1966 | 2,680.0  | 0       | 2,680.0  | 555.0    | East Branch, Conn. (UC).....             | 1964 | 1,900.0  | 840.0   | 2,740.0  | 1,900.0  |
| Littleville, Mass. (UC).....        | 1964 | 6,982.0  |         | 6,982.0  | 4,946.0  | Hall Meadow Brook, Conn. (C).....        | 1962 | 2,560.0  | 570.0   | 3,130.0  | 2,558.0  |
| Mad River, Conn. (C).....           | 1963 | 4,770.0  | 670.0   | 5,440.0  | 4,767.2  | Hancock Brook, Conn. (UC).....           | 1965 | 3,560.0  | 0       | 3,560.0  | 2,201.0  |
| North Hartland, Vt. (C).....        | 1961 | 7,115.0  | 0       | 7,115.0  | 7,068.6  | Northfield Brook, Conn. (UC).....        | 1965 | 2,810.0  | 0       | 2,810.0  | 1,604.0  |
| North Springfield, Vt. (C).....     | 1960 | 6,830.0  | 0       | 6,830.0  | 6,772.5  | Thomaston, Conn. (C).....                | 1960 | 14,200.0 | 0       | 14,200.0 | 14,200.0 |
| Otter Brook, N.H. (C).....          | 1959 | 4,062.5  | 0       | 4,062.5  | 4,062.5  | Subtotal.....                            |      | 25,030.0 | 1,410.0 | 26,440.0 | 22,463.0 |
| Townshend, Vt. (C).....             | 1961 | 7,400.0  | 0       | 7,400.0  | 7,152.4  |                                          |      |          |         |          |          |
| Subtotal.....                       |      | 52,342.6 | 670.0   | 53,012.6 | 47,827.3 |                                          |      |          |         |          |          |

Footnotes at end of table.

## Flood control and hurricane program (projects) New England—Continued

| Project                                                | Completion date | Federal cost          | Non-Federal cost     | Total     | Federal appropriations through fiscal year 1964 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN—continued</b>                |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Torrington (East Branch), Conn. <sup>2</sup> (C)       | 1958            | 389.3                 | 151.3                | 540.6     | 389.3                                           |
| Torrington (West Branch), Conn. <sup>2</sup> (C)       | 1960            | 250.0                 | 169.0                | 419.0     | 250.0                                           |
| Waterbury-Watertown, Conn. <sup>2</sup> (C)            | 1961            | 265.0                 | 25.0                 | 290.0     | 265.0                                           |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 904.3                 | 345.3                | 1,249.6   | 904.3                                           |
| Total, Housatonic River Basin                          |                 | 25,934.3              | 1,755.3              | 27,689.6  | 23,367.3                                        |
| <b>MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN</b>                           |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Dams and reservoirs:                                   |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Hopkinton-Everett, N.H. (C)                            | 1962            | 21,100.0              | 0                    | 21,100.0  | 21,055.4                                        |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Lincoln (Public Law 99), N.H. (C)                      | 1960            | 120.0                 | 0                    | 120.0     | 120.0                                           |
| Total, Merrimack River Basin                           |                 | 21,220.0              | 0                    | 21,220.0  | 21,175.4                                        |
| <b>THAMES RIVER BASIN</b>                              |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Dams and reservoirs:                                   |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Buffumville, Mass. (C)                                 | 1958            | 2,998.6               | 0                    | 2,998.6   | 2,998.6                                         |
| East Brimfield, Mass. (C)                              | 1960            | 7,020.0               | 0                    | 7,020.0   | 6,843.3                                         |
| Hodges Village, Mass. (C)                              | 1959            | 4,425.0               | 0                    | 4,425.0   | 4,421.8                                         |
| West Thompson, Conn. (UC)                              | 1965            | 6,400.0               | 0                    | 6,400.0   | 2,690.0                                         |
| Westville, Mass. (C)                                   | 1962            | 5,570.0               | 0                    | 5,570.0   | 5,542.2                                         |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 26,413.6              | 0                    | 26,413.6  | 22,495.9                                        |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Norwich Channel, Conn. (C)                             | 1958            | 1,210.0               | 72.0                 | 1,282.0   | 1,210.0                                         |
| Total, Thames River Basin                              |                 | 27,623.6              | 72.0                 | 27,695.6  | 23,705.9                                        |
| <b>COASTAL RIVER BASIN</b>                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Farmington I, Cochecho, N.H. <sup>2</sup> (C)          | 1956            | 87.5                  | 3.0                  | 90.5      | 87.5                                            |
| Farmington II, Cochecho, N.H. <sup>2</sup> (C)         | 1959            | 56.5                  | 2.0                  | 58.5      | 56.5                                            |
| Canton, East Branch Neponset, Mass. <sup>2</sup> (C)   | 1963            | 176.8                 | 93.6                 | 270.4     | 176.8                                           |
| Cherryfield, Narragansett, R., Maine <sup>2</sup> (C)  | 1961            | 203.0                 | 3.5                  | 206.5     | 203.0                                           |
| Total, Coastal River Basin                             |                 | 523.8                 | 102.1                | 625.9     | 523.8                                           |
| Grand total, B                                         |                 | 151,062.7             | 8,350.8              | 159,413.5 | 132,758.4                                       |
| <b>C. UNDER DESIGN</b>                                 |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| <b>CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN</b>                         |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Dams and reservoirs:                                   |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Colebrook River, Conn.                                 | 1964            | <sup>4</sup> 15,000.0 |                      | 15,000.0  | 564.0                                           |
| Sucker Brook, Conn.                                    | 1965            | 1,000.0               | 360.0                | 1,360.0   | 90.0                                            |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 16,000.0              | 360.0                | 16,360.0  | 654.0                                           |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Westfield, Mass.                                       | 1964            | 4,800.0               | 1,320.0              | 6,120.0   | 309.0                                           |
| Total, Connecticut River Basin                         |                 | 20,800.0              | 1,680.0              | 22,480.0  | 963.0                                           |
| <b>HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN</b>                          |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Dams and reservoirs:                                   |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Black Rock, Conn.                                      | 1965            | 6,100.0               | 0                    | 6,100.0   | 245.0                                           |
| Hop Brook, Conn.                                       | 1964            | 4,800.0               | 0                    | 4,800.0   | 175.0                                           |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 10,900.0              | 0                    | 10,900.0  | 420.0                                           |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Ansonia-Derby, Conn.                                   | 1966            | 6,705.0               | <sup>5</sup> 425.0   | 7,130.0   | 65.0                                            |
| Total, Housatonic River Basin                          |                 | 17,605.0              | 425.0                | 18,030.0  | 485.0                                           |
| Grand total, C                                         |                 | 38,405.0              | 2,105.0              | 40,510.0  | 1,448.0                                         |
| <b>D. FUTURE (AUTHORIZED, RECOMMENDED OR DEFERRED)</b> |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| <b>CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN</b>                         |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Dams and reservoirs:                                   |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Claremont, N.H. (deferred)                             |                 | 13,000.0              |                      | 13,000.0  | 237.0                                           |
| Gayville, Vt. (deferred)                               |                 | 20,000.0              |                      | 20,000.0  |                                                 |
| The Island, Vt. (deferred)                             |                 | 4,900.0               |                      | 4,900.0   |                                                 |
| Victory, Vt. (deferred)                                |                 | 1,900.0               | 1,200.0              | 3,100.0   | 178.0                                           |
| Total, Connecticut River Basin                         |                 | 39,800.0              | 1,200.0              | 41,000.0  | 415.0                                           |
| <b>HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN</b>                          |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Local protection projects:                             |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Danbury, Conn. (recommended)                           |                 | 2,400.0               | <sup>6</sup> 680.0   | 3,080.0   |                                                 |
| Derby, Conn. (recommended)                             |                 | 3,200.0               | <sup>7</sup> 250.0   | 3,450.0   |                                                 |
| Total Housatonic River Basin                           |                 | 5,600.0               | 930.0                | 6,530.0   |                                                 |
| Grand total, D                                         |                 | 45,400.0              | 2,130.0              | 47,530.0  | 415.0                                           |
| Total, flood control                                   |                 | 292,684.5             | 17,507.2             | 310,191.7 | 191,631.5                                       |
| <b>II. HURRICANE (ALL SINCE 1955)</b>                  |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| <b>LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECTS</b>                       |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Completed or under construction:                       |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Fox Point, Providence, R.I. (UC)                       | 1966            | 11,130.0              | 4,770.0              | 15,900.0  | 8,299.0                                         |
| New Bedford, Mass. (UC)                                | 1965            | 11,266.0              | 7,000.0              | 18,266.0  | 7,114.0                                         |
| Pawcatuck, Conn. (C)                                   | 1963            | 650.5                 | 283.5                | 934.0     | 650.5                                           |
| Stamford, Conn. (UC)                                   | 1967            | 7,240.0               | 4,360.0              | 11,600.0  | 624.0                                           |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 30,286.5              | 16,413.5             | 46,700.0  | 16,687.5                                        |
| Under design:                                          |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Narragansett Pier, R.I.                                | 1965            | 1,575.0               | <sup>8</sup> 785.0   | 2,360.0   | 50.0                                            |
| New London, Conn.                                      | 1966            | 2,940.0               | 1,260.0              | 4,200.0   | 40.0                                            |
| Point Judith, South Kingstown, and Narragansett, R.I.  | 1966            | 3,120.0               | <sup>9</sup> 1,710.0 | 4,830.0   | 40.0                                            |
| Wareham-Marion, Mass.                                  | 1966            | 4,410.0               | 1,890.0              | 6,300.0   | 86.0                                            |
| Westport, Conn.                                        | 1964            | 217.0                 | 93.0                 | 310.0     | 30.8                                            |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 12,262.0              | 5,738.0              | 18,000.0  | 246.8                                           |
| Future—Authorized:                                     |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Mystic, Conn.                                          |                 | 1,750.0               | 750.0                | 2,500.0   |                                                 |
| Recommended:                                           |                 |                       |                      |           |                                                 |
| Stratford, Conn.                                       |                 | 4,690.0               | 2,010.0              | 6,700.0   |                                                 |
| Westerly, R.I.                                         |                 | 3,460.0               | 1,750.0              | 5,210.0   |                                                 |
| Subtotal                                               |                 | 8,150.0               | 3,760.0              | 11,910.0  |                                                 |
| Total, hurricane                                       |                 | 52,448.5              | 26,661.5             | 79,110.0  | 16,934.3                                        |
| Total, program                                         |                 | 345,133.0             | 44,168.7             | 389,301.7 | 208,565.8                                       |

<sup>1</sup> Includes recreation facilities developed since 1955 and estimated cost for future planned development.<sup>2</sup> Small flood control projects not specifically authorized by Congress.<sup>3</sup> Includes reimbursement of \$2,090,000 required from local interests for water supply costs.<sup>4</sup> Includes reimbursement of \$5,344,000 required from local interests for water supply costs.<sup>5</sup> In addition, local interests have expended \$1,444,000 for flood control improvements.<sup>6</sup> In addition, local interests have expended \$1,852,000 for flood control improvements.<sup>7</sup> In addition, local interests have expended \$785,000 for flood control improvements.<sup>8</sup> Includes \$10,000 for public landing to assure public access and use.<sup>9</sup> Includes \$310,000 for public landings, beach facilities, and spoil disposal areas to assure public access and use.



Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 10, insert the following: "791,200, to remain available until expended, of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Company to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the Milford Dam and Reservoir project".

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 15, insert the following: "and of which not to exceed \$131,500 shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 12, line 4, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 as proposed in Senate Document 89, Eighty-eight Congress, for maintaining suitable water quality in the Colorado River shall be nonreimbursable."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 12, line 13, insert: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$26,000 shall be available for reimbursement to the city of Malta, Montana, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable".

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 12, line 18, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$200,000 of funds made available for improvement of access roads in the Weber Basin project area shall be nonreimbursable."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$150,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 14, line 3, insert the following:

#### "EMERGENCY FUND

"To reimburse the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052), for expenses incurred for repair of flood damage to irrigation facilities of the Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects, \$1,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include certain tables.)

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

### STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11134) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman have any idea whether the funds for the so-called civil rights bill will be in the gentleman's bill, or will they be in a supplemental appropriation and, therefore, charged to another fiscal budget?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is my understanding that the additional funds required as the result of the passage of the civil rights bill of 1964 will be in a supplemental bill. My subcommittee has already held hearings with regard to the requests for funds for implementation of the civil rights bill, and have marked up the various items presented by the Government agencies concerned.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, MAHON, BOW, and LIPSCOMB.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AP- PROVED AND SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 7, 1964:

H.R. 3757. An act for the relief of Witold A. Lanowski;

H.R. 6413. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8479. An act for the relief of Georgette D. Caskie;

H.R. 8954. An act to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9689. An act declaring a portion of Bayou Black and Bayou Terrebonne, La., non-navigable waterways of the United States.

On August 10, 1964:

H.R. 82. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses;

H.R. 4732. An act to change the name of the United States Olympic Association to the United States Olympic Committee;

H.R. 7419. An act to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8654. An act to terminate a restriction on use with respect to certain land previously conveyed to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and to convey to said city the mineral rights in such land;

H.R. 10483. An act to authorize the sale of 58.19 acres of Eastern Shawnee tribal land in Oklahoma;

H.R. 10973. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians; and

H.R. 11754. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 1145. Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

On August 11, 1964:

H.R. 1892. An act to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360);



H.R. 2977. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe;

H.R. 7215. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians and certain other lands to the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7833. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes," approved August 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 619);

H.R. 11622. An act to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 and 1965 as a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

On August 13, 1964:

H.R. 5302. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder;

H.R. 6007. An act to permit the vessel SC-1473 to engage in the fisheries; and

H.R. 10503. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

On August 14, 1964:

H.R. 11049. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 852 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11904) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the text of the bill (H.R. 12363) to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas) for one year until June 30, 1966, as an amendment to the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of H.R. 11904, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 11904, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3060 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11904 as passed by the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any particular controversy over this resolu-

tion, which provides for the consideration of an extension of the National Defense Education Act. It also makes in order an amendment which would extend for 1 year the impacted areas bills, Public Laws 815 and 874. There will be amendments offered to the proposal reported by the committee, but they will be handled during the period of general debate and under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to speak about a colleague of ours who will not be with us after this session of Congress, who was the father of the National Defense Education Act when it was passed in 1958, the author of the bill, the individual who steered it through the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Alabama, our distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT.

I know of no man in the history of the American Congress, and I say advisedly the history of the American Congress, who has done more for the cause of education than has CARL ELLIOTT. His loss to the country and to the Congress is a great one. I hope that the people of his State will recognize in the near future how bad a mistake they made in not returning him to this great legislative body. He has been my friend for a long time. We came here together. He is an able man, completely dedicated to the public interest, one of the great public servants of our time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Alabama. It seems to me during the 10 years I have worked on legislation dealing with problems in the field of education in this House, there has been no single piece of education legislation that has done more to improve the quality of education and also no single piece of legislation that has done more to make it possible for the very capable but needy students to go on to a higher education than the national defense education act.

The 680,000 loans which thus far have been made to needy students will serve as a lasting tribute to the most able gentleman from Alabama who has contributed so much—as the gentleman from Missouri has already stated—to the cause of education.

There are so many people in our land who pay lip service to the importance of education in the national scheme, but the gentleman from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT, has really and truly dedicated his years of public service to making life more meaningful for those who have not had an adequate education and available job opportunities. It is he who has reminded this House on many occasions that we are not just spending money on education—we are investing money in education and we are investing in the future of this country, and it is the best possible investment we could make.

The experts tell us that 40 percent of our economic growth is credited not to capital investment, but to our investment in education.

Of course, the individual benefits from the greater earning capacity; the taxpayer benefits from the increased gross national product; and the country benefits from a greater income and a much higher standard of living. Mr. Speaker, history will undoubtedly record with great pride CARL ELLIOTT's contributions in many, many areas but none more noble than his very successful efforts to make it possible for hundreds of thousands of young men and young women to go to college. He really and truly believes that a nation such as ours, one that spends 15 times as much on legalized gambling as is spent on higher education, can afford to gamble on every young man and every young woman who really wants an education and is willing to work for it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in paying tribute to one of the finest and most outstanding Members of this House of Representatives, a person who has served with great honor and who has made so many valuable contributions.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] in their eloquent tribute to our colleague CARL ELLIOTT. I likewise came here when the gentleman from Alabama was admitted to this body in the 81st Congress.

I do not know of any Member who has contributed more in the field of education than CARL ELLIOTT. I hope that the Nation will continue to have the services of this able public servant and statesman.

CARL ELLIOTT achieved a legislative triumph as author of the National Defense Education Act and wherever he may henceforth venture this monument will remain in these Halls.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also wish to pay my tribute to CARL ELLIOTT for the work he has done on the National Defense Education Act. I had the good fortune of serving with him while he was on the Committee on Education and Labor, and I know of his interest in education and his capable service.

I also wish to point out, naturally, from my side of the aisle, that this came during the Eisenhower administration. This legislation had strong bipartisan support. I remember well how the colleagues on this side of the aisle worked closely with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] in developing the best legislation which could be developed, passed through this body and the other body with strong bipartisan support.

This kind of development in educational legislation means strength throughout our country. When we get into big hassles on purely partisan lines









An Act

78 STAT. 682.

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and for other purposes, namely :

Public Works  
Appropriation  
Act, 1965.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; \$13,295,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, \$22,194,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$210,000 of this

16 USC 661 note.

appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); \$939,943,200, to remain available until expended, of which \$64,000 shall be available for the readjustment and alteration of the facilities of the Broughton Mutual Telephone Co. to permit continued service to the present users not affected by the M<sup>131</sup> Dam and Reservoir project; and of which not to exceed \$131,944,108<sup>131</sup> shall be available for construction of a road from the new townsite of Lower Brule to Counsellor Cove, and such work is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Restriction.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation; \$158,676,000, to remain available until expended.

#### FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, \$4,150,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be merged with this appropriation.

69 Stat. 186;  
76 Stat. 1194.  
33 USC 701n.

## GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal Engineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; \$15,575,000.

## FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$77,862,000, to remain available until expended.

45 Stat. 534;  
49 Stat. 1511.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by section 19(b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and sixty-seven for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

5 USC 2318.  
68 Stat. 1114.

## THE PANAMA CANAL

## CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

## OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; maintaining and altering facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and payments of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, \$29,088,000.

72 Stat. 327.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles of which nine are for replacement only, and of which twelve are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; improving

76A Stat. 7, 26.



facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Canal Zone Government use; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; \$4,821,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters of non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding \$16,500.

74 Stat. 827.

# PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

## CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including maintaining and improving facilities of other Government agencies in the Canal Zone for Panama Canal Company use.

61 Stat. 584.

## LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$10,639,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which eighteen are for replacement only, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

68 Stat. 1114.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding \$30,000: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100 per diem.

60 Stat. 810.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

#### CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction" for the purposes set forth in the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885), \$1,800,000.

16 USC 17j-2.

### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

43 USC 371 note.

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed \$450,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, \$11,404,000, of which \$10,054,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further*, That \$370,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

16 USC 661  
note.

## CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$185,616,500, of which \$83,030,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 as proposed in Senate Document 89, Eighty-eighth Congress, for maintaining suitable water quality in the Colorado River shall be non-reimbursable: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be made available under this appropriation for the construction in Contra Costa County, California, of any portion of the interceptor drain in connection with the San Luis Unit which terminates at any point east of Port Chicago: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$26,000 shall be available for reimbursement to the city of Malta, Montana, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$150,000 of funds made available for improvement of access roads in the Weber Basin project area shall be nonreimbursable.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$40,219,000, of which \$30,758,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,605,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*,

That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

#### LOAN PROGRAM

70 Stat. 1044. For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, \$12,307,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

43 USC 388.

#### EMERGENCY FUND

43 USC 502, 503. To reimburse the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052), for expenses incurred for repair of flood damage to irrigation facilities of the Milk River and Sun River Federal reclamation projects, \$1,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965.

#### UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

70 Stat. 107. For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, \$62,300,000, of which \$57,800,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and \$4,500,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

43 USC 620g.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

59 Stat. 54. For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$10,400,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

#### SPECIAL FUNDS

32 Stat. 388. Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of



December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived. 45 Stat. 1057; 54 Stat. 774.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467): *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations". 58 Stat. 487. 49 Stat. 666. 59 Stat. 54.

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Limitation.

Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

43 USC 504 and note.

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

### CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, \$87,420,000, to remain available until expended.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$14,980,000.

### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

## SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,000,000.

58 Stat. 890.

## SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

## CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$2,610,000, to remain available until expended. 58 Stat. 890.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, \$1,680,000.

## CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted. Emergency construction.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Fire prevention.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received. Operation of warehouses, etc. 47 Stat. 417.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration. Southwestern Power Administration, funds.



# TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

## OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$30,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$2,261,573,000, and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*. That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*. That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*. That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

## PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and eighty-four for replacement only (including three at not to exceed \$3,000 each), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase of one aircraft; \$363,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*. That not to exceed \$9,000,000 of the amount appropriated herein for an isotopes production plant may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to enter into an arrangement for construction of all or a part of such plant by private industry.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Procurement of materials, etc.

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*. That appro-

prorate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1965 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Transfer of funds.  
Reports to congressional committees.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Restriction on fellowships.

Penalty.

## TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided.

61 Stat. 584.  
31 USC 849.

### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed \$4,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of \$50 per day.

68 Stat. 1114.  
60 Stat. 810.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

48 Stat. 58.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed two hundred and eight for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$47,915,000, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$39,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$92,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

42 USC 2641  
note.  
60 Stat. 810.

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$4,000,000.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

Purchase of  
motor vehicles.

SEC. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at \$1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be \$1,950.

Compensation  
payments.  
Citizenship  
status require-  
ment.

SEC. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*. That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a

Penalty.



felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

Exceptions.

SEC. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

Quarters allowances, etc.

5 USC 3033-3038.

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of \$6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

U. S. Code Annotated, etc., price limitation.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

59 Stat. 597.

60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 507. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

Foreign credits, use.

31 USC 724.

SEC. 508. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies

held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1965".

Approved August 30, 1964.

Publicity or  
propaganda.

Short title.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1479 (Comm. on Appropriations of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 1326 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 110 (1964):

June 16: Considered and passed House.

Aug. 7: Considered and passed Senate, amended.

Aug. 14: House and Senate agreed to conference report.





